00111850

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-1.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016

AN

HISTORICO-CRITICAL

INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BY H. A. CH. HÄVERNICK,

DR. AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF KÖNIGSBERG.

111850

ae

TRANSLATED BY

ALEXANDER THOMSON, A.M.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, GLASGOW THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY.

D/E/113

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.;

SEELEY & CO.; WARD & CO.; JACKSON & WALFORD.

DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCL.

God
222.1
Hav/His
111850

ERRATA.

P. 3, l. 5.—For *nation* read *notion*.

P. 59, bottom.—Transpose the position and numbers of the notes.

N.B.—The numbering of the sections is different from the original, where the numbering is continued from the previous part of the work. Hence our § 1 is § 105 in the German work. By adding 104, therefore, the number of any section may be ascertained according to the original.

THE TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE work, of which the present volume is a translation, is a portion of a larger work, entitled "*Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament*," a Manual of Historico-critical Introduction to the Old Testament; and forms the first part of the Special Introduction.[1] It is the publisher's intention to bring out, in the latter part of this year, a translation of that division of the above work which relates to the General Introduction to the Old Testament, including in one volume the discussion of such topics as the formation of the Canon of the Old Testament, the history of the Hebrew Language, the Ancient Versions, &c. This, it is hoped, will be found extremely serviceable for use as a class-book in our Theological Institutions. The translation, which will be executed by Dr W. L. ALEXANDER of Edinburgh, will be accompanied by an introductory notice of the merits of HÄVERNICK as a critic and commentator, which relieves the present translator of the task of attempting to do very imperfectly what will be satisfactorily performed by an abler hand.

With respect to the present work, the translator would only add that, while it is occupied almost exclusively with a discussion of the question, so much debated of late in Germany, as to the genuineness of the Pentateuch—treating both of the Mosaic authorship and of the historical credibility of the work, points that are essentially connected; it would be wrong to regard its publication as superseded by the previous appearance of HENGSTENBERG'S valuable Dissertations on the same subject. It is at once a more complete and methodical, and also a more compact work, answering to its title of *a Manual*. The principles also on which it is based, and of which it presents a thorough and masterly exposition in its treatment of the different sections of the Pentateuch as they come under review, are, in the translator's opinion, of the highest importance, such as alone will lead to a satisfactory and consistent apprehension of the peculiar character, spirit, and bearing of the Old Testament writings. They will prove the surest antidote to the rationalistic and infidel spirit, which is now seeking to diffuse itself amongst the educated and reflecting classes in this country. We see it here encountered, on its native soil, by an able antagonist, and foiled with the right weapons.

THE TRANSLATOR.

GLASGOW, April 29. 1850.

[1] Published at Erlangen, 1837, being only the year after the appearance of the first volume of Hengstenberg's Dissertations on the Pentateuch, which accounts for our work containing no reference to the latter.

REMARKS.

P. 20, l. 18. "*Mapharionо.*" This is the Syriac form of the word which Assemani gives in his Latin version as *Maphrianus.* His note on the passage referred to, explanatory of the title, is as follows:— "Dignitas apud Jacobitas Patriarchali inferior, Metropoliticâ major; Primatem rectè vertas. Orienti præsidet, hoc est, Chaldææ et Assyriæ, necnon extremis Mesopotamiæ partibus, sub Antiocheni Jacobitarum Patriarchæ potestate." It was therefore a dignity peculiar to the Syrian Monophysites or Nestorians, who were called Jacobites from Jacobus Baradæus.

P. 118, l. 2. "*The morality of the advocates of a carnal outward reformation.*" In the original it stands, "die Moral der Rehabilitatoren des Fleisches," which it would have been better to render, "the morality of the rehabilitators of the flesh," or "the Morality of the St Simonians," for the term is descriptive of that school. It may be better understood by the following passage, from a paper of Joseph Mazzini's in the People's Journal, vol. ii. p. 363, in which he traces a connection between the opinions of Bentham, and the views of the school referred to.

"Like Bentham, the writers of the Simonian *Producteur* concentrated their labours chiefly on material interests; like Bentham also, their gait; their first tendencies were rather irreligious and devoid of ideality. When at a later period these changed, utility or production did not the less remain the dominant idea. Their religion was the religion of enjoyment; they desired less to raise earth towards heaven, than to bring heaven down to earth; and there, in fact, their dogma ended. Everywhere, in what they somewhat coarsely called the *rehabilitation of the flesh*, in their appreciation of art and artists, in their theories of woman and love, in their valuation of accomplished works not by the purity of the motives or the inward sufferings of the agent, but only by the degree of utility produced by them, the idea that proceeded from Bentham shows itself more or less disguised, but always visible. I am convinced that those who shall seriously study St Simonianism will not contradict me."

It may be well to mention that the expression occurring in the same sentence, "*our opponents,*" is used by the translator there and elsewhere through the work, instead of the more exact translation of *die Gegner*, "THE *opponents*" sc. of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. The idea conveyed is equivalent in point of fact, and the latter expression sounds awkwardly in English in most connections, and indeed would often have been ambiguous or obscure. It has been occasionally used where these objections did not apply. The same remark holds good of the translation generally given here of "die gegnerische Ansicht."

PREFATORY REMARKS

CONNECTED WITH THE

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

---

§ 1. DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS.

THE threefold division of the Canon of the Scriptures arose out of the nature of the canonical literature, and the position which its authors occupied in the Theocracy. Since it consequently owes its origin in no way to accident or arbitrary arrangement, but rests on deeper internal grounds, we must regard it as of great importance in the treatment of the separate portions of the Canon. But we shall facilitate the scientific representation and review of these books by keeping in our eye their contents and formal composition, classing together those that are the same in these respects; and thus we shall distinguish more clearly the different modes in which the powers of the different authors were exerted. Accordingly, the first division we make is between the *poetical* literature and the *prose*. With the former, however, we must join the peculiar class of the *prophetic* writings, so that only the *historical* books remain as prose.

§ 2. ON THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GENERAL.

The contents of the historical books of the Old Testament are as far as possible from being of a general and indefinite character.

The object they exhibit is one on the contrary that is very strictly limited and exactly marked. As the subject of ancient historical composition is in general purely national, so Hebrew history also does not rise above this ancient, simple conception. The particular nature of its object, also, must therefore be determined by the peculiar character of the nation. The Old Testament historiography makes no claim to the character of a universal history; it is throughout the special history of the people of God, of the kingdom of God in the earth in a definite form, *the Theocracy*. The subject of its records is the internal development of this people in their covenant-relation to Jehovah, with which every thing external is connected only as the outward and visible form, requiring a constant reference to that inward and essential principle. Hence arises the necessary limitation, that it is only where the covenant-people come in contact with other heterogeneous elements and tendencies, meeting with other nations, that any thing foreign is brought into the circle of Old Testament history, and always in such a way as to appear accessory and incidental.[1] Hence also the circumstance, which is certainly not to be attributed to chance or arbitrary choice, that the history becomes silent or defective whenever the theocratic idea recedes as a fact into the back-ground; where the history of the covenant-people as such leaves off, owing to their peculiar condition and circumstances, there gaps are found in the historiography, as well as in the history itself. Thus the periods of the sojourn in Egypt and in Babylon are only very briefly treated; for the proper element of the life of the Theocracy is Canaan, at a distance from which the people ceases to be historical in the sense we have mentioned. Thus the period of the Judges, and the reigns of many kings, are treated only in very limited sketches, and apparently in a fragmentary manner. The completeness of the historical account, which in itself is always relative, can accordingly be rightly estimated in every case only by a reference to its aim and plan as compared with its contents.[2]

The idea which forms the foundation of these contents, and which is everywhere either supposed or fully expressed, is that of the manifestation of Jehovah amongst, and to, his people. This is not an

1 Augusti justly remarks, § 84, that the book of Genesis itself forms no exception to this.

2 Comp. Augusti, § 86.

abstraction, but the display of a purely actual condition. Here we find, namely, not an undefined enquiry of man after God; on the contrary, here God seeks after man.[1] Man has found his God in the divine commonwealth, and that assuredly by no means as a mere nation, but after a thoroughly concrete mode in a living relation to himself, even to his whole and innermost being.[2] In this way the condition here exhibited is one essentially diverse from that of all other nations; even as the idea of the Theocracy, in this sense and in opposition to a mere Hierarchy, with which, however, it has often been confounded,[3] is one quite peculiar, and found nowhere else, since it has its origin truly in and from God, and therefore is a unique idea. Hence also the peculiarity of the theocratic life can be conceived only as a continual contest, either for God and along with him, or against God; as either a firm adherence to him and his revelation, or a self-seeking struggle, apostacy from him; Jehovah, however, invariably, in the midst of every contest, showing himself righteous and merciful.

In complete accordance with this subject of the history is the representation and treatment of the same. On the one hand there reigns in these documents a spirit of lofty, noble simplicity. The mode of narration is yet hardly advanced beyond the simplicity of oral relation; it is everywhere destitute of any attempt at elegance or external ornament of expression: the primitive beauty of this historical form lies only in the object presented, the importance and nature of which here meet us as displayed in its original shape.[4] Along with these traces which are everywhere to be found of ancient genuine simplicity (such as are to be seen, for instance, in the loose connection of facts, the want of transitions, the numerous repetitions, &c.), there breathes on the other hand a spirit, deeply penetrating and vigorously animating the whole, which is,

1 So early as Gen. iii. 8, 9, this main thread, which stretches through the whole Old Testament history, is pointed out.

2 On this point Steudel speaks excellently, Glaubenslehre p. 298 and foll., where amongst other things it is justly said: "it is indeed to be wondered at, with what confidence the ignorance of our day sets up the assertion as unquestionable, and speaks without consideration, as if the distinguishing feature of the Old Testament were the doctrine of God as an abstraction, standing at a distance from man," &c.

3 *E. g.* in Heeren, Ideen vol. ii. 2, Appendix iv. On the other hand, see a more correct opinion in Leo, Lehrbuch des Universal-Geschichtes i. p. 16, and foll. (Compendium of Universal History.)

4 Comp. Pareau, Instit. interp. V. T. p. 351—354.

at the same time, the necessary subjective condition of the right apprehension, the true understanding of the theocratic history.[1] Yet it did not escape the ancient profounder method of historical composition, that, unless a *præsens numen* were recognized in the march of history, history itself is incomplete; and if Herodotus, for instance, does not forget, in speaking of misfortune, to remark, that it is an ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις,[2] Diodorus Siculus and Plato agree with him, the former claiming for the historian that he should be regarded as the servant of Providence, the latter exclaiming: ὁ θεὸς πάντα γεωμετρεῖ.[3] Even a Livy must confess, in opposition to a frivolously minded age: non sum nescius, ab eâdem negligentiâ, quâ nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credunt, neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia, neque in annales referri. Cæterum et mihi vetustas res scribenti, nescio quo pacto *antiquus fit animus et quædam religio tenet*, quæ illi prudentissimi viri publice suscipienda censuerint, ea pro dignis habere, quæ in meos annales referam (xliii. 13.) "With winged swiftness Adrastea moves through the histories of the Greeks; but Judaism and Christianity are the first to exhibit, in connection with the occurrences of the world, a guiding, providing, and loving God. And what is all history, if we look not back to the fountain, from which flows down the cataract of ages?" (Tholuck *ibid.*) This problem was well understood by the old historiographers of the Hebrews; in them it appears solved in the clearest and completest manner. Never has any other nation imposed on the historian such a condition with so unrelaxing strictness, as that all occurrences are to be placed in so peculiar a point of view, the light cast upon them from one centre, and all the individual parts to have their importance measured by the essential connexion they have with the Theocracy as a whole. However diverse the books may be in what appears their external aim, as the historical accounts in the books of Kings, Chronicles, and the Prophets, yet this fundamental view extends through all with wonderful unity. Hence the Hebrew historian is as far as possible from recognizing in his history anything like accident and

1 Hence the sacred historians also were called *Prophets* (נביאים): see Winer, Reallexicon I., p. 484, Anmk.

2 I. 34, comp. Bähr ad i. 32, i. p. 81.

3 Comp. Tholuck, Apolog. Winke f. d. Studium d. A. T. (Apolo etic hints for the study of the Old Testament) p. 10 and foll.

arbitrary choice; on the contrary, the higher interference of the divine hand is everywhere revealed to the childlike faith of his mind. Thus no situation was so dark and perplexing as not to receive in this way its full clearness and importance (comp. *e. g.*, Judges iii. 1, 4, vi. 7, 8, &c.); and as in the sacred songs of the Temple, the history, both as a whole and in single features of particular prominence, was the theme of praise to Jehovah's name, so in its composition it must always have come before the people in imposing grandeur, as a sacred representation, pervaded by the Spirit of God.

This conception of the history has been called Theocratic Pragmatism, but there has been connected with the name the bad idea of a very confined, partial, and therefore untrue circle of vision.[1] As to this view of the history, it is of less consequence what derivation it gives of that theocratic pragmatism (referring it perhaps in general to oriental notions of history, though that point may very well be disputed); but what deserves most attention is, that it represents a purely subjective idea, as being exalted to a general objective historical view, and maintaining an uncompromising isolation from every mode of treatment that goes beyond that idea. This view,[2] however, assumes in general such a position as scorns all true historical inquiry; for if history in general cannot be conceived without a constant reference to God's procedure in it—(without which it would be a mere game of chance; and then the very thing which this view wishes to avoid, namely the constant reference to an immediate cause in history, meets us in a strangely confused and aggravated degree, in a host of immediate causes, while on the other side only one immediate cause is spoken of)—far less can sacred history, considered in reference to this its object, dispense with that conception. "Church history (says Herder), without the spirit of God, is the figure of Polyphemus, with his eye extinguished." And as the Theocracy itself was truly an actual institution, like the Church of the New Testament, it could be as little understood in its historical development, if regarded without

1 Comp. *e. g.* Bauer, Introd. § 199; Bertholdt iii. p. 749; Meyer, Hermeneutics of the Old Testament ii. p. 224 and foll.; and thus even historians, as Schlosser, Universalh. Uebers. i. p. 108.

2 [That is, the view of the history mentioned at the commencement of the previous sentence.—Tr.]

that spirit, as the church without the πνεῦμα of the Lord. But the more serious fault in all this lies in the misapprehension of the kingdom of God itself; which falsely degrading it into a mere external, political commonwealth, would here imperiously require the theocratic life to be conceived of in the ordinary, trivial fashion. The conception of it, however, is only a reflection of this higher life itself; it is a mere illusion to think the former can be thrown aside as an entirely isolated phenomenon, for it is itself but the reflection that still remains to us of the concrete light and life of the Theocracy.

But, were this conception of the theocratic history to be in truth such as confined it, and fixed for it certain definite aims, yet it ought not therefore to be called a narrow conception. It rather supposes a higher point of view, which, while it gives the particular subject a limited character, is itself by no means particular and subordinate, but rather the truly universal one, from which all the rest receives its true light. Where the thought—"God reigns in his kingdom"—is firmly held and carried out in all its clearness and distinctness, in the actual existence of this his kingdom, there necessarily the fate of other nations also must be conceived as standing in relation to God's sacred everlasting arrangement. Hence the theocratic historical point of view is one truly universal; even as the institution itself, as a temporary, mundane, and transitory form, already includes, in its everlasting design, the germ of that higher system which embraces the world.

The peculiar nature of the Theocracy is still more misunderstood, when modern theology applies to the introduction of the divine agency, in the form of revelations and miracles, the appellation of *theocratic mythology*,[1] and assigns it to the region of the fabulous, as being unworthy of God, and therefore untrue; on which hypothesis the mythical interpretation of the historical Scriptures is based. We feel it to be a point of subordinate importance, whether it is thought possible, after a fashion that has now become obsolete, to make a distinct separation of the historical ground-work in this mythic fabric, while the mythic element is stripped off as mere clothing and envelopment; or whether, as

1 Comp. De Wette, Introd. § 136; and for the literature of the subject, in particular Hartmann, on the Pentateuch, p. 337, and foll.; Bauer, Hebrew Mythologie, i. p. 1, and foll.

desired by the new tendency which has gained strength, especially since De Wette wrote, the historical element is looked upon in general as dubious, and to be left *in suspenso*, while endeavour is solely directed to point out the fiction, and the idea that lies at the bottom of it.

The idea of the Theocracy is that of the glorification of God in his kingdom: the initial and ultimate point of that glorification is the founding of such a kingdom itself: all the rest is only the farther development and disclosure of what is thus supposed, the necessary series of divine acts, founded on that first act of his free love. This is the primary principle of the divine revelation and agency; with the admission or denial of this stands or falls all that is secondary and derived. That first wonder displayed by God in this temporal sphere is, however, so far from being explicable as the mediate result of ordinary changes, that it rather stands out indisputably as a creative act of the divine majesty and compassion, and must be regarded as an immediate result of these attributes. We have a proof of this in the isolation in which it stands in the midst of a world, that knows not this kingdom, to its own dishonour; and in the effect of it, the subjective result that arises in the form of a new life that is called forth, with blossoms and fruits springing up from the ever-fresh and vigorous root.

A mythus can be spoken of only where a mythology exists; for the mythus has its root in the ideal mythological belief of the people. As long as the attempt to construct a mythology of the Hebrews proves unsuccessful, single mythological representations may indeed be spoken of, but not a mythological system; and still less successful will be the attempt to point out a certain series of mythi, such as we find in every other nation.[1] For even the latest religious view of the Old Testament, while assuming natural religion as necessarily supposed in the Hebrew system,[2] has yet partly rested content with those historical proofs for it which are most defective and easily set aside; partly has left unexplained the transition from that natural religion to the monotheism of the Hebrews (its apprehension of which, besides, is very partial); and has made the violent leap only the more startling by finding itself com-

1 Comp. Pareau, de Myth. cod. s. interp. p. 104, sq.

2 [Der Hebraismus, lit. Hebraism.]

pelled to acknowledge the peculiar character of the latter. But certainly Hebraism is seen at once to be most decidedly opposed to all mythology, in its recognizing the only God, as well as the living God, and the right relation of the world to this only true God, in opposition to every false relation which is peculiar to heathenism in that respect. The proper essential distinction which obtains between the heathen mythi, and those which one has wished to find in the Hebrew history, lies therefore in the essentially different relation of the fact to God as he appears in it; so that here the question everywhere is concerning the one true scriptural idea of God. A just conception of this, however, cannot be formed from mere individual parts, but only from the mode of revelation as a whole; and thus again each individual part will receive its right estimation, only as it is recognised in the relationship it holds in the entire system of the divine manifestation, the divine purpose and the ordinances and arrangements arising hence, this test being established as the highest criterion of its internal truth.

But what completely annihilates the mythical interpretation is, that it quite does away with the position in which the mythus stands to history. The mythic element stands at the beginning of all history, invariably precedes it, and is superseded by it, as soon as the spirit of historical inquiry gains ground among a people. Hence likewise the division of periods into the *ἄδηλον*, *μυθικὸν* and *ἱστορικὸν* was quite allowable among the Greeks,[2] but not with the Hebrews. Such a division would here be the more impossible, as mythic elements are supposed to be found not only in the histories of Genesis, but just as much in the history of Elijah and Elisha,[3] and in the book of Daniel, consequently in the latest productions of Hebrew literature. The mythus always has its root in the far distant past; for there alone does its ideal aspect find its real expression and image,[4] for which the present, lying near in point of time, presents nothing adequate. Consequently we should have no

1 Comp. Vatke, Bibl. Theol. vol. i. p. 700, where it is even said, that it is remarkable that the Hebrews were quite devoid of originality in the sphere of natural religion—that the history of the Hebrew natural religion has more an accidental character, &c. Let the author consider how he can bring this into accordance with his earlier arbitrary notions concerning the old deeply-rooted natural worship of the Hebrews.

2 Comp. Varro ap. Censorin. de die nat. c. 21; and Pareau thereon, l. cit. p. 76, sqq.

3 Comp. *e. g.*, the explanation given by Hartmann, *ibid.* p. 310, ff.

4 [*i.e.*, It is only the scenes and events of remote antiquity that are suited to be the vehicle of the thought contained in the mythus.—Tr.]

history at all among the Hebrews, if we were to admit the truth of the mythical view. It is true it also calls to its aid the results of a so-called criticism, which are to determine that the time of the occurrences themselves, and the recording of them, lie at a greater or less distance from each other. But then the circumstance just mentioned would here again require that all the historical books should be referred to the most remote age. With the fulfilment, however, of this requisition will arise the great dilemma, how history could here act so uncritically as to adopt all that was transmitted by tradition in this its uncertain and fabulous form, without bringing it into harmony with an altered age.[1] In short, the internal inconsistency of the mythical interpretation is thus made still more evident.

Let us, however, examine more closely the hermeneutical side of the mythical explanation. Because of the scornful violation of all hermeneutical principles, De Wette justly decided against the arbitrary separation, or rather the dragging in of what was natural and ordinary into the miraculous and extraordinary part of the historical documents, as this practice had been pursued to an extreme by G. L. Bauer, Eichhorn, &c. The inconsistency of treating these documents partly as history, and partly as mythology, became most strikingly observable, just as the arbitrary method had reached its culminating point. It was, therefore, a new and important step in advance, when the historical basis in one of the most important parts of the Old Testament, the Pentateuch, was declared to be completely buried over, and in place of that foundation an epic one was put forth in preference, so that in this theory we find everywhere the free play of fancy, united with a certain learned treatment, but nowhere ascertained historical points to lay hold of. It is besides an important circumstance that the same motive which constrained to this explanation with regard to the Pentateuch,[2] must necessarily urge to a like opinion in the case of almost all the historical books of the Old Testament. The view taken of the Pentateuch has thus a deeper interest, affecting the historical repre-

The historical pragmatism sets aside whatever is marvellous and fanciful, changes mythi into history, and supplies principles such as suit its own time, to the facts thus presented, so as to connect them together. See Otfried Müller, Prolegomena to a scientific mythology (German) p. 97. Lachmann, de fontibus histor. Livii i. p. 34, sq.

2 "To the cultivated understanding (so says De Wette, Einleitung, § 145) it is at the least doubtful whether *such marvels* really happened."

sentation as a whole. In it the unavoidable consequence shews itself of course. If the mythical view is once admitted, and shewn to be essentially adherent to the document, no alternative remains but to pronounce the records falsified and disfigured, and to seek in them, instead of history, only poetry and poetic fiction. But the reproach cast by De Wette on his age, of giving the documents a most heterogeneous character, falls back here precisely on himself, and the tendency to which he gave rise. For it is hermeneutically impossible to demonstrate that these authors intended to produce poetry, however much the notion may be pressed that we have here to do with the Hebrew, not the Greek, Epos,—that the poetry appears not in its pure form, but mixed with other elements; in this way the confusion only becomes still greater, indeed truly chaotic. In respect of form as well as matter, the most essential requisites of poetry are wanting; yea, the documents themselves distinguish so carefully between poetical and historical description, that we have not the least trouble in seeking to discover the transition. We may leave altogether out of account the general consideration, how we can conceive of such an epic representation arising out of Hebraism, which appears to have possessed of its own only a lyrical poetic element; and the fact, that this lyric poetry bears a constant reference to the history, presupposes it, and assumes it as its theme, but according to laws of treatment quite different from those which are here attributed to it.[1] By such a procedure, however, hermeneutics can never be securely established; and the demand made by that science, that we should recognize in the historical documents the definite intention which they exhibit of giving a plain and simple historical account, can in nowise be set aside.

Among other nations of antiquity, such as the Indians, Greeks, and Romans, the poetic element has constantly preceded the historical. Among them for the most part a jejune style of history is the first to develope itself out of the epic poem. There, antiquity with its sacred mist having left only a faint remembrance in the national mind, the poet feels the impulse to call up again the splendour of the past as a living and present thing. Hence the obscurity which rests on the first history of all the ancient nations, and the contra-

1 See Pareau, loc. cit., p. 96, sq.; also comp. Meyer, Apology for the historical composition of the histor. books of the Old Testament (German) p. 52 sqq.

dictory legends which defy connection, through which we have a glimmering of no more than the most general outlines of a certain historical foundation.[1] A glance at the earliest Hebrew history presents quite a different scene. This people, the whole of whose peculiar existence depends upon, and derives its conditions from, the events of its earliest age, has this age itself fully presented to its view, in clear and definite details, with all the completeness of a living reality. The history gives precise information concerning the beginning of the nation, its spread, its wanderings, and the deeds of its fathers. The sacred original tradition has pursued no erring track with manifold crossings, has assumed no diversified forms. It appears closely connected with one race, by which it is most carefully preserved, forming at an early period an integral part of its sacred literature. However much stress may be laid on the hints that the ancient records themselves supply, concerning the mode in which a sure historical memorial was kept of remarkable occurrences by external means, such as the erection of stones, a local reference to trees, &c.;[2] still the main fact that serves to explain that circumstance, must be a faithful tradition maintaining its existence in the midst of a closely associated race shut up in itself, and subsequently the early consignment of that tradition to written documents. And if we look at the qualifications required in the theocratic historian, as these did not lie in the department of an artistic ability directed rather to what was external, but as to their essence consisted in an inward genuine theocratic sentiment, and the assistance of the divine Spirit; they must only have favoured and facilitated the accomplishment of this undertaking. Hence, the suppression in the history of the author's subjectivity explains also the fact, that the greater part of the historical books have come down to us anonymous, so that it is only from internal grounds that we are able to discover the time of the composition, and sometimes also the author. In the same higher objective tendency must also chiefly be sought the explanation of the circumstance, that in the Hebrew records, especially the later ones, we meet with frequent instances of compilation; or rather with extracts from other sources, and the elaboration of them with a definite intention, and for a certain end. The authors, following the Pentateuch as their pattern,

1 Comp. Pareau, loc. cit., p. 65, sqq.

2 See Winer, Real-Wörterbuch i., p. 483, sqq.

look on themselves as being only the servants and instruments of the Theocracy. It is their most sedulous care to keep this everywhere in view as their highest concern. Thus, in the later development of the people, the mere keeping of annals appears widely separated from the theocratic historiography. Hence it is a vain undertaking to seek the origin and culture of historical composition in the rise of the schools of the prophets:[1] its origin lies far higher, even in the mode in which the exertions of Moses were put forth for his nation. There, in the inspiration of the same spirit, lies the necessary continuation of that kind of agency, and also the peculiar form of historical composition connected with it.

1 As is done by Augusti, § 87; Hartmann, id., p. 319, sqq.

THE PENTATEUCH.

§ 3. APPELLATION AND DIVISION OF THE PENTATEUCH.

The name given by the Jews to this work as a whole; is that taken from the work itself, הַתּוֹרָה; but in its complete form, with reference to the division of the same, חֲמִשָּׁה חוּמְשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה, *i.e.*, "the five quintals of the Law," while they also use חומשין simply for the whole, and חומש for a single book.[1]. Hence the Greek name ὁ νόμος is interchanged with πενταΐτευχος, compounded of πέντε and τεῦχος, which in the later Alexandrian usage signifies *a volume*. The division into five books is found in Josephus and Philo,[3] and appears to owe its origin to the Alexandrians.[4] Traces of a sevenfold division are also found among the Jews, which, however, has certainly remained merely ideal.[5] The names in use among the Jews for the separate books are taken from the initial words of each book (אֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת בְּרֵאשִׁית, &c.), besides which, however, many others are found;[6] among the Christians, from the Greek names significant of the contents.

1 See Hottinger, Thes. philol. p. 460.

2 See Passow's Greek Lex. on the word. On the mode of composition, see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 412, sq. The word is feminine in Greek, ἡ βίβλος being supplied (Orig. T. xiv. in Joan. p. 218); in Latin, it is masculine, *liber* being understood. Stange incorrectly takes it to be neuter (in the Anall. of Keil and Tzschirner i. 1, page 22, foll.)

3 Cont. Apion. i. 8, καὶ τούτων πέντε μέν ἐστι τὰ Μωϋσέως.—Philo de Abrah. p. 274, ed. Col. τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἐν πέντε βίβλοις ἀναγραφέντων ἡ πρώτη καλεῖται καὶ ἐπιγράφεται γένεσις. He regards this as a Mosaic appointment, de migrat. Abr. p. 305, F.: παγκάλως οὖν ὁ ἱεροφάντης μίαν τῆς νομοθεσίας ὕλην ἱερὰν βίβλον ἐξαγωγὴν ἀνέγραψέν. On the other hand, 1 Cor. 14, 19 does not refer to this, as Jerome (ep. 103 ad Paulinum) will have it (see Palairet. abso. philol. p. 405 sq.).

4 Comp. Leusden. philol. Hebr. p. 45, sq. Otherwise J. D. Michaelis, Einl. i. p. 303. It is a strange opinion of Bertholdt's, iii. p. 759, that the division reaches as far back as the origin of the Pentateuch.

5 See tr. Shabbath, f. 116, 1; Chagigah, f. 16, 2; Jarchi, ad Provv. 9, 1; and Breithaupt upon it.

6 See Hottinger, as above, p. 456 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. ii. p. 72.

§ 4. THE AUTHOR OF THE PENTATEUCH CALLS HIMSELF MOSES.

We set out with that question which has the greatest influence on the entire form and character of the critical investigations which are to be developed in what follows, and which alone can properly introduce them according to their principle: what our work says concerning its own composition? If we received from it on this point no answer at all, or an unsatisfactory one, it would then require as an anonymous production to be taken up on an entirely different footing from what is the case when it assigns itself with positive decision to a definite time, and gives itself out as the work of a definite person. This question must therefore be taken up simply by itself, and not be by critical caprice confused unmanageably with others, as has even recently been done.[1]

Frequent mention is certainly made in the Pentateuch of certain matters being written and recorded by Moses; but the passages that are of that nature require close examination, since their meaning, and the consequences deducible from it, cannot be established without paying regard to opposing views. Of such a kind, for instance, is the following. In Ex. xvii. 14, after the victory over the Amalekites, Moses receives the divine command to record the fact in the סֵפֶר. The reason of this command was, that that remarkable deed should be a *memorial* (זִכָּרוֹן), to wit for Joshua, that the remembrance of Amalek should be destroyed. Accordingly this special command of Jehovah appears sufficiently accounted for. Judging from this passage, Moses at first seems to be the recorder only of this fact; but it deserves attention that he was to write it in *the Book*—(בַּסֵּפֶר). Hence it is clear that this record was meant to form a part of a more comprehensive book, presupposed as well known.

It has been thought, however, that this passage should be restricted simply to the recording of that fact, consequently to a

1 See von Bohlen, die Genesis hist. krit. erläut. Einl., p. xxxvii. foll.; by whom this purely internal question relating to the work itself is confounded with the external and archæological one, whether, according to the history of the art of writing, Moses, as author, can have been able to write? In our days this removal of the right critical point of view—at an earlier time a very favourite method—deceives no longer, but only serves to evidence the superficiality of its author.

single composition of Moses, and that on the following grounds.[1] 1. The translation *in the* (known) *book* rests simply on the pointing; and besides, supposing it were correct, we might still translate: "in the book which thou shalt prepare," not "which thou hast begun to write;" and in general it cannot be supposed that Moses had continued the Pentateuch just thus far, and was here commanded to annex this occurrence. But the correctness of the pointing is clear from the other passages, which will immediately be adduced, where the article is constantly found even among the consonants;[2] and it is clear also from the word סֵפֶר itself. If we learned nothing farther concerning the book and its contents, this solitary instance would be dubious; but the contrary is decidedly the case. Besides, it is evident from the words כָּתֹב בְּ, that it is the insertion of a matter in a larger work that is here treated of. If it stood simply בְּסֵפֶר, the addition would be quite superfluous. To what purpose were the remark that this composition was to form a proper history, complete in itself?[3] Much rather may we say that the addition has a satisfactory sense only when read בַּסֵּפֶר, *in the book, i. e.*, the one known to Moses, his book. And we cannot see why it should not be supposed that Moses had such a book already in hand. 2. "It is evidently introduced as a peculiar circumstance that Moses recorded of the history of the journey through the wilderness a single occurrence of that kind, which was also very remarkable and wonderful in its character. Now this would not readily have been done, if he had written a connected history of the whole journey." This objection rests on a misunderstanding of the passage in question. It it not to the *recording* of the act that the narrator gives importance, but to the *permanency* of the fact, as a monument that "the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation" (ver. 16.) Only in case the writing down had here been mentioned by itself, and without being specially accounted for, would the objection have any significance.

Accordingly the meaning of סֵפֶר in that passage receives its complete elucidation from a comparison with other passages. This

[1] So Bleek most acutely, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1831. No. 3, p. 511.

[2] Comp. J. D. Michaelis, Einl. p. 154, foll.

[3] This is the signification that must constantly be attached to סֵפֶר.

is the case with the very next passage in Exod. xxiv. 4, 7. Here it is said that Moses had written out all the words of Jehovah, and then that he had taken "the Book of the Covenant," and read out of it to the people. If we compare this passage with Ex. xxxiv. 27, 28, an important difference immediately presents itself: in the former place it is "the Book of the Covenant" in general that is spoken of; in the latter it is "the words of the covenant, the ten words." Thus in the latter it is evidently a special expression relating to an individual part; in the former a larger, more comprehensive work is spoken of.

Bleek, however (p. 512), would have the "Book of the Covenant" also to bear a special reference to chaps. xx.—xxiii. This is impossible, 1. because of the context. For, according to xxiv. 3, Moses *told* the people all that immediately preceded, and the people vowed allegiance to Jehovah. Then, after recording the same, Moses takes the Book of the Covenant, reads out of it, and the people again vow allegiance. If the act has a meaning in this its double reference, the former applies to that which was special, which had shortly before been spoken by Jehovah (comp. xix. 7, 25); the latter to what was general, what God had done and intended to do for Israel. For, "according to all these words (last read to them), Jehovah makes a covenant with the people" (ver. 8)—which evidently refers to xix. 5 ("ye shall keep my covenant"), which passage, however, has the closest connexion with xix. 4 as the historical foundation of this covenant. Hence this "Book of the Covenant" cannot possibly have contained *only* that which immediately precedes. 2. The same is clear from the words themselves. ברית *Covenant* stands here in a general sense, and must therefore be understood according to those definitions, which the Pentateuch itself assigns to the idea. Now in the Pentateuch mention is made as frequently of "the covenant with the fathers" (see Levit. xxvi. 42—45; Deut. iv. 31) as of the covenant with Israel; yea, the former covenant forms the basis of that which was made with Israel, so that together they constitute a great whole (Deut. v. 2, 3.) With the indefinite form of expression, this point of view must be maintained throughout. Accordingly ספר הברית must always designate the recorded statement of this covenant-relationship in general, as its basis is found in Genesis, and not a particular covenant-act. That every Hebrew must have taken this view of it, is plain from the

passages 2 Kings xxiii. 2—21, where the same designation is manifestly employed in the wider sense.

According to this, we should have in Exodus even, a testimony to the entire composition of the "Book of the Covenant" by Moses, as far as such evidence in the nature of the thing could have advanced at that period; and we must regard it as a continuation thereof, when it is remarked, in mentioning the places of encampment, that they were recorded by Moses (Num. xxxiii. 2.). But in Deuteronomy, most especially, we meet with the more frequent mention of the work composed by Moses, and, after what has been remarked, we cannot admit that this mention "is of another kind than in the earlier books."

Here, in the first place, in most cases it is the "written book of the Law" that is spoken of; and both the connection and the express assertion, Deut. xxxi. 9, 24 foll., attribute the writing of it to Moses; comp. xvii., 18 foll., xxviii., 58 foll., xxix. 19, 20, 27. But these passages (it seems) are chargeable with "great obscurity," so that one cannot see what is really to be understood by that "book of the Law, written by Moses." The proper book, however, the writing, completion, and tradition of which are now in question, is not to be thought of; for "we should then be obliged to suppose that Moses had anticipated all this in the historical narrative before it happened." That would be an extraordinary thing, and we must therefore regard these statements as additions by a foreign hand; in which case we no longer have the testimony of the work concerning itself.

But a simple and just interpretation exposes the whole of this argument as having nothing in it whatever. We begin with the *commencement* of Deuteronomy. There it is said i. 5: "in the land of Moab *Moses began to write down the following Law.*[1] From this we conclude that the Lawgiver came before the assembled people, having in his hand the volume of divine revelations, contained in Deuteronomy, already written—a piece of information,

1 This is the only correct interpretation of the passage, which even by the LXX. was misunderstood (διασαφῆσαι) from a false notion of בֵּאֵר, into which error they were probably led by the לֵאמֹר following. But this refers back to ver. 3, דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה וגו׳. The signification *explanare* (see Gesenius and Winer lexx., s.v.), which in *Hebrew* usage is unheard of, has been invented for באר, only with a view to this passage, while Deut. xxvii. 8, Habak. ii. 2, speak decidedly against it.

which is completely intelligible and natural, only on the supposition that at an earlier period a recording of the Law had taken place, to the completion of which Moses now proceeded. In this way this testimony is closely connected with the notices found in the earlier books of the writing out of particular parts, which form a whole, a *sepher*. There is then also no difficulty in understanding the expression in iv. 8: "as this *Torah* which I set before you this day," (comp. xvii. 18, foll.), and the passages where it is said, "the words of the Law which *are written* in this book," as xxviii. 58.

Thus then runs the reference throughout, according to the nature of the subject, even to the close of the discourses of Moses xxxi. 8. There we read a statement that stands in connection with the fact i. 5, that Moses had written out this Torah, and delivered it to the priests with the command to read it before the whole people every Sabbatic year. Here, again, the passage i. 5 brings us to that point of view that is perfectly correct. Moses writes *first* the Law, and what was done and should be done in connection with it, then the matter of fact, the delivering over of the Law which followed; but then Moses received a new divine command, to compose the "Song" which the children of Israel were to learn (xxxi. 19.) Upon this Moses writes out the Song "on the same day," and then follows the close of the whole, xxxi. 24: "when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this *Torah* in a *Sepher*, until they were finished (completely);"[1] but the proper close could not come in here, since the Song of Moses was announced, but not yet communicated; hence, for the introduction of it, the addition xxxi. 25—30 was required, which, however, by its close (עַד־תֻּמָּם), plainly points back again to the earlier one. "As the conclusion of the treatise," says Eichhorn, iii. p. 223, "the place of the Song was after the subscription of his (Moses') name—a proof that the Song has continued to be what it was intended for, an appendix to the history of what Moses did and said, after reading to the people the compendium of his laws."

But if Moses himself may, in this way, have suitably attached

1 As it is the general custom of oriental authors to name themselves at the end, as well as at the beginning of their works. Comp. Sirach l. 27 (which example also is so far interesting in reference to the present case, as the author after that conclusion goes on farther with the narrative; comp. Bretschneider ad h. l. p. 677, sq.) Abdollatiph. compend. memor. Æg. p. 157, ed. Paulus; and de Sacy in the Relation de l'Eg. par. Abd-Allatif, p. 453.

his own subscription to his work, we are obliged by this form of conclusion to admit, that the work demands to be regarded as proceeding from Moses, as to its written origin; nor is there any reason why we must adopt the opinion that, in that subscription, we have the work of a foreign hand; so that we must decide from the conclusion, as to the whole of the Pentateuch, even if earlier passages did not expressly affirm the same, that it claims to be considered as written by Moses.

§ 5. EXAMINATION OF THE PRETENDED "OPPOSING FACTS."

Where we find so express a testimony to the composition of a work by a certain author, as is the case in the Pentateuch, it would be the more to be wondered at, if testimonies to the contrary effect were found in the same works, shewing that the real author had no wish to conceal the fact that the subscription and other intimations concerning the composition were a mere deception—that the pretended and the real authors were indeed two totally different persons. Those positive testimonies, when placed by the side of the others that were directly opposed to them, would then be enigmatical; and who, then, could have had the shamelessness to subjoin them in this general manner? So strange a contradiction in the same work—where shall an analogy to it be found in literary history, except in the work of the most impudent and senseless impostor? Just hear how the view of the later school of critics gets itself off on this point! Hartmann (Forsch. üb. d. Pent. p. 538 foll.) thinks that "the author of the four last books wishes to be taken for Moses," but from p. 544 foll. he remarks it as "an uninterruptedly continuous phenomenon that the person of the writer is separated from the person of Moses as two different beings." Or, as Von Bohlen thinks (p. xxxviii.), it may be the writer's view that those pieces (?) were really written by Moses—"but the narrator *everywhere* betrays that he is distinct from Moses." That latter modification has, however, a certain sense: it is only *particular portions* that the Pentateuch represents as having their written origin with Moses,[1] but as a whole it proclaims itself not to

[1] Comp. also Bertholdt, Einl. iii. p. 766, ff. But the *unity* of the Pentateuch, hereafter to be proved, declares to the contrary.

have been written by Moses. In Hartmann's assertion we must confess we can discover no sense whatever.[1]

Yet let us examine the opposite grounds more closely. It is said: "the Pentateuch everywhere speaks of Moses in the third person, as of an individual quite separate from it and remote, covers him with praise and expressions of honour, and in its traditions assigns Moses quite an objective place (Deut. xxxiii. 4, 5.)[2] With this is joined the confident assertion that an historiographer must constantly speak of himself in the first person. It is true that, *e. g.* Bohaddin, the contemporary of Saladin, in the biography of that prince, on every occasion that he mentions himself, employs the first person—for a reason easily intelligible, because he plays an insignificant subordinate part in relation to the chief hero of his history. On the contrary, Barhebraeus, in the third part of his Chronicle, which contains the history of the Patriarchs of the East, where he speaks of the period of his own primacy, constantly speaks of himself in the third person, chiefly by the designation of his dignity as "*Mapharionо*;"[3] for this was conformable to the style required by the continuous course of his historical narrative. And that Cæsar, in his Commentaries, invariably uses the third person, is certainly not to be explained by "the fashion" of his time[4]—for the style of Cæsar is distinguished precisely by remarkable simplicity and inartificial naturalness,[5]—but by the whole spirit and aim, the peculiar plan of his work: as Xenophon also on one occasion falls into the same form (Mem. Socr. i. 3, 9, ff.). This shows clearly that the manner and custom of a people must in this question be taken into the account, as well as an author's aim and mode of thinking. We discover here, in the next place, by the comparison of passages, such as Is. vii. with c. viii., where the prophetic and historic styles stand beside each other, that speaking in the third person is quite peculiar to the historic style. So we find it Is. xx. 36—39, Amos vii. 12, ff., &c.[6] Besides, the very interchange of the persons, that occurs in Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, serves

1 As De Wette also intimates, Einl. p. 210.

2 Comp. Hartmann especially, p. 545, ff.

3 Comp. Assemani, Bibl. Orient. ii. p. 248, sq.

4 Which is Hartmann's opinion, l. c.

5 Comp. Bähr, Gesch. d. Röm. Liter. p. 264.

6 See Kleinert, über d. Aechth. d. Jes. p. 482; Hitzig, Comment. zu Jesaias. p. 69; Hengstenberg, Beitr. i. p. 227, ff.; Keil. üb. d. Chron. p. 107, ff. 122, ff.

only to show how the old, simple, purely objective style of historical narration everywhere struggles with a more subjective representation, the latter forcing its way here and there. In the Pentateuch, accordingly, we have the ancient form purely maintained throughout, and it remains for us only to show how that form is connected with the nature, contents, and intention of the work. This connection is not less evident here than in the Gospels of Matthew and John: that the subjectivity of the apostles is thrown into the back-ground, is a proof how absorbed was their whole inner being by the objective phenomenon, which they bring before their readers in its entire pureness and majesty.[1] In the same manner also is the whole appearance and procedure of Moses presented in its objective form to the people: it is not a particular individual that will here treat with Israel and make a covenant; but Jehovah himself everywhere speaks and acts, Moses is only the servant, the instrument in the hands of the Lord. Hence the expression must not here be moulded by a subjective view; the opposite would have ill corresponded with the whole legislatorial character of the Pentateuch: we have here to do with what was done and spoken objectively: as the divine word, it must be to Israel a constant clue to direct them; the laws must form a sacred institution, the history a deeply searching admonition and powerful encouragement. Occupying this position, the author would require to give no place to egotism:[2] he looks upon himself as only one with the history; in it he lives; in clear and definite outlines the will of the Lord stands unveiled before his eyes; nothing is farther from his desire than to glorify himself; the wonderful ways and dealings of the Lord are alone the subject of his work.

But here those passages are brought forward against us, in which commendations of the Lawgiver are to be met with, as Ex. xi. 3, Num. xii. 7, or a characteristic of him, as Num. xii. 3.[3] That in the passages adduced these observations are quite in their appropriate place, no one who regards the context can fail to see. The context shows that it was Jehovah who caused the miracles to be wrought in Egypt by the hand of Moses; indeed in Ex. xi. 3

1 Comp. Olshausen, Comment. i. p. 32, 315 [Olshausen on the Gospels, vol. i. p. 24 of Creak's translation, p. 28 of Loewe's.]

2 [Literally: "to the I."—Tr.]

3 Comp. Hartmann, p. 548.

it is expressly said, that Jehovah gave his people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians, and that his servant Moses was distinguished above all, was very great in the eyes of that nation. This is no more than was required by historical fidelity; it is the same integrity that does not allow John to suppress the fact, that he was the disciple whom the Lord loved. In such an acknowledgment there is not vain glorying and pride, but only admiration of the grace of God, and praise to him who proves himself glorious and faithful to his own. Indeed, on the contrary, the exhibition given of the character of Moses is such as could proceed only from himself, not from an encomiast of a later period. The admission which Cicero makes in reference to autobiographers: *verecundius ipsi de sese scribant necesse est, si quid est laudandum, et prætereant, si quid reprehendendum est* (*ad div. V.* 12, 18), does not apply to our work. Here no concealment whatever is made of the weakness which the man of God felt when he received his call, of his infirmities, or of his sin, for which he was excluded from Canaan. By this the author only proves how faithfully he kept to his proposed aim, namely to produce a purely objective historical representation. A truthful impartiality and freedom from every egotistical tendency are in this way most nobly maintained. Holding such an opinion, we should indeed be surprised, were the historical narration to bear another character than it does; and still more so, when we direct our attention to the divine purpose, to that which, according to the will of God, his revelations by Moses were intended to be to Israel.

There is still less force in the remark, that the Pentateuch looks back upon the Mosaic era as *a period long since elapsed.* (Hartmann, p. 550 ff.) We should be obliged to copy out the Pentateuch, if we wished to show that every occurrence of the time of Moses moves before the author's mind as that which is present. In passages such as Ex. xiii. 8, ff., Lev. xxii. 33, xxv. 55, &c., instead of that time being spoken of as one long past, the reverse may be shown to be the case by a closer examination. But it is most surprising to see such passages as Deut. viii. 2, ff., xxxii. 7, ff., v. 3, where the *Fathers* are spoken of, with whom God made a covenant, &c., adduced in support of that remark. Or does the time of fulfilment, of the wandering in the wilderness, perchance not belong to the Mosaic period? Could Moses in Deuteronomy,

according to the time, speak otherwise of the period which lay behind him, and of the generation which had perished in the wilderness, to the new body of people which was on the eve of passing into Canaan?

There is accordingly nothing left, but to declare with Von Bohlen, p. xxxviii., that the narrator has simply *imagined* the recording; that is, in other words, he has presented his readers with the fiction, the lie, of its being Moses from whom it proceeds. This is decidedly cutting the knot of the argument; the concession is certainly important that the writer wishes to pass for Moses; but his assertion is at once rejected as untrue. We must then examine more narrowly, whether there are grounds discoverable to decide this question, which is of vital importance to our work, so much to its disadvantage.

§ 6. UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH. POSITIVE EVIDENCE OF IT.

With the question, whether the author of the Pentateuch mentions his own name, is naturally connected the following: Whether, in that case, he can be regarded as author of the *whole*, or whether its internal constitution, from the heterogeneous nature of its component parts, allow to him only a certain share in its composition?

The general character of an historical work, with respect to its plan, is shown most readily by its chronological arrangement. If unity prevails in that respect, then at least the scheme of the whole, the formal unity, is a favourable sign for the unity of its authorship. The chronology of the Pentateuch is very definite and exact, maintaining a close coherence. It is at first chronologico-genealogical, connecting the computation of time with the lifetime of the Patriarchs of Israel, reckoning from the commencement of the same to the birth of the first-born. The account is thus free from all uncertainty, which otherwise was unavoidably connected with the ancient idea of a γενεὰ;[1] and thus this simple mode of reckoning could be continued throughout the patriarchal age with as much ease as accuracy, without the genealogical state-

[1] See Bähr ad Herod, i. 7.

ments containing gaps or perplexities, as *e. g.* is the case with the Arabian family registers. This chronological plan, which is exactly followed as far as Jacob's history extends, then gives place to another, arising out of the event which forms an epoch in Israelitish history, the removal of Jacob into Egypt, which forms again a firm chronological foundation,[1] that is here all the more necessary, as now it is no longer the history of single families, or of one family that is treated of, but that of a whole people. Then, joining on to this, we have the reckoning according to the second great event, which is related to the former, viz., the departure of the Hebrews; and this chronology is invariably continued through the four last books of the Pentateuch.[2] This method has on its side the analogy of the oriental historians, which also connects the chronology with certain memorable events as the initial points of an era.[3]

It now appears, however, on the comparison of this chronology, precise in itself, with the historical contents of the Pentateuch, that the Pentateuch admits of a natural division into certain groups or separate masses, since considerable portions of time are quite passed over in the historical account, and others are treated with a greater extension of details. This circumstance in itself may lead us to conclude, that the sources of information consisted of fragmentary materials, but it may also arise from a designed mode of representation, arranged according to a fixed plan. To ascertain this, the analysis of the particular parts in their relation to the whole is necessary, and that will decide the point.

The internal unity of the Pentateuch, however, when taken in conjunction with its own notices concerning its composition by Moses, can consist in nothing else than in this, that its entire contents refer to the Mosaic period, indeed to the covenant made through Moses between Jehovah and his people, *so that everything in it before the time of Moses shall be shown to be a preparation for that fact, and all the rest to be the development of it.*

This requisition is completely fulfilled in Genesis in the first

1 Comp. Gen. xlvii. 9; Exod. xii. 40; comp. Gen. xv. 13.

2 Comp. Ranke, Untersuchungen üb. d. Pent. i. p. 10, ff., 30, 32, ff. (Researches concerning the Pentateuch.)

3 Comp. Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. ii. p. 501 (Manual of Chronology.)

place. With the history of the world's origin begins the history of Israel. That might be thought to arise from the fashion of the East, which is fond of commencing its special history *ab ovo*. Therefore it must here be shown, whether that commencement is only loosely prefixed from regard to custom, or stands connected with the whole by a deeper reason. Now, the work of creation, in its fundamental plan, at once proclaims itself as intimately connected with the Theocracy. It is not any sort of isolated law, insignificant in relation to the whole, that is brought out by the consecration here conferred on the number of seven; but the whole of the formal structure of the Theocracy itself, in its consistent carrying out of this sacred cycle of time, is closely conjoined with it. Viewed from its internal side, the fundamental idea of the Theocracy, to be holy like to the holy God, and the consecration of the people, the priestly family, &c., arising thence, can be apprehended only in their relation to the beginning of the human race, and its original relation to God; so that the Theocracy is connected with Gen. i. 27, as the restoration of that which formerly subsisted.

Apart from the original destination of man, the rise of the Theocracy is inexplicable; but it is not less enigmatical apart from the account of the transgression, and the subjection of the race to sin. Again, the first transgression of man is incomprehensible, while the *possibility* of sin in his case is not imagined, which Gen. ii. brings out, representing man as "dust of the earth," and thus prepares the way for Gen. iii. (comp. iii. 19 with ii. 9.) But how the external natural life of man is in perfect harmony with his higher origin, is shown also by the same chapter, which is thus closely connected with i. 28—30. He also cultivates the ground, but so that it is entirely subject to him, the Lord of creation, and the keeper of Eden (ii. 5, 15, comp. with i. 28, ff.).

The human race in its origin is a unique thing, related in its unity to God. Through sin it becomes severed from him, violently rent away. Thus the history of Cain and of his family shows the progress of sin, and the ever increasing severity of the curse upon it (comp, iv. 11 with iii. 17); and in the internal, even as in the external life, the separation goes on widening. But beside the Cainites who dwell on the east of Eden, there rises up another race, possessed of an inward principle of unity, closely united by the

worship of Jehovah, and therefore above all significantly pointing back to the original condition and fall of Adam (iv. 26, v. 1, 3.).

The more that mutual separation goes on among the members of the human race, the more is the true religion concentrated in a particular family; which religion from its nature is but one, even as God is one. The reason of that disseverance is the opposition that has taken place between God and man: the schism is always growing wider (vi. 1, ff.), and can be ended only by the annihilation of the one party. Thus in the account of the deluge we have the opposition carried out to its extreme point; and it would prove absolute, were it not removed by the interposition of the divine act, the covenant of the Lord with Noah. That covenant in its entire exhibition stands forth as the fact, without which the Theocracy was impossible; therefore in it also we find already a partial anticipation of the law of Israel.[1]

Man, though he is evil from his youth up, is yet now blessed anew, and that with an everlasting promise. But again, the alienation and separation of the human race manifests itself, practically testified by the surrender of the One Truth (Gen. x., xi. 1—9); and hence the divine truth again becomes, from its nature, associated with one family, so that all now hastens on to the history of the Shemite (xi. 10, ff.) Abraham, with which the primitive religion of Hebraism first comes into a position that is properly preparative for Mosaism. Here, on the one hand, we no longer meet with general promises, but with the special blessing through the Son (Isaac), and through a land assigned to him; on the other hand, we meet with the peculiar sentiments of the Father of the faithful, the subjective effect of the peculiar character of the objective blessings. The entire character of the Patriarch is therefore peculiar and typically theocratical: in him the offices of the Theocracy appear united in one person, according to the primitive simplicity of ancient times. He appears as *Prophet* (*Nabi*), to whom the word of Jehovah comes (xx. 7, comp. xxii. 16): he is *Priest*, building his altars on the holy places of the land, and upon Moriah not only fulfilling the obedience of faith, but also pointing to the future destination of the mountain and the sacrificial worship: he is the *King* of the land, which God grants to him in perpetual possession, and there he has his hereditary burying-place;

[1] See Ranke, as quoted above, p. 40.

there Melchizedec, the possessor of Salem, does solemn homage to him. Thus the history of Abraham is a history written in the genuine theocratic spirit; marking an important epoch in the preparation of the divine commonwealth, and therefore it is, indeed, "in the narrow compass of the history of one family, an everlasting history of the individuals as of the nations."[1]

On that account we have much of Abraham's history communicated to us, and little of the quiet domestic life of Isaac; but the few incidents that are given of the latter, his residence in Gerar and his relation to Abimelech (chap. xxvi.), all have a national Hebrew reference: he follows with evident fidelity and dependence the footsteps of his father (xxvi. 18.) The narrative, therefore, hastens on the more to the Patriarch of Israel, Jacob, the founder of the ten tribes; showing how he receives the blessing of God, how passing through sin and adversity, he yet holds fast the word of God, and, contrary to all expectation, returns richly blessed to the land of his fathers, and is named Israel. At his entrance into it, and while dwelling there, he constantly receives the most remarkable proofs of divine compassion; and he passes through the land in all directions, raising altars to Jehovah, and humbly praising his name. The history of Jacob is written precisely for that people, which required to be encouraged to return out of Egypt and take possession of the promised land.[2]

Once more the narrator gives the names of the twelve sons of Jacob, who were in the land and buried Isaac there (xxxv. 23, ff.). This race preserved itself unmixed with the collateral line of Esau and his race, the Edomites. But Esau also has his promise that he should be the patriarch of a people (xxv. 23); and this the narrator shews, remarking at the same time, the mixture of Esau with the Canaanites.

The history of Joseph, which follows next, prepares us for the removal of the Israelites into Egypt, and thus immediately introduces the establishment of the Theocracy. As the movements of

1 Leo Lehrbuch der Univ. Gesch. (Grammar of Universal History), i. p. 564.

2 "It is manifest, what importance those memorials and names from the times of the patriarchs must have had for the people, who, standing at the very gates of the land, were about to attempt the decisive passage over the Jordan. They were voices to them from the olden time, inciting them to the conflict for the land of their fathers; a writing, whose traces, graven in the soil itself, spoke the more intelligibly. They must have been not less delightful and admonitory to later generations." Ranke, as above, p. 52.

divine Providence were wonderful at the departure, so were they also at the entrance of Israel into that land. It is this connecting bond of dealings, mysterious in themselves, but clear when viewed as a whole, that links the histories of Joseph and Moses intimately together. The position of the Israelites in reference to the Egyptians in the time of Joseph and in that of Moses, forms a startling contrast; and it is here to be shown how Jehovah acts with his people in their relation to the heathen, blessing the latter when they treat his people kindly, and destroying them when they prove persecutors. But it is thus he prepares for himself a peculiar people, by declaring them to be such in the midst of the heathen, and everywhere manifesting his own glory.

The only interruption to the history of Joseph is Gen. xxxviii. It relates to the family-history of Judah, the important head of a tribe (xlix. 8, ff.), and was necessary in order to account for the precise character of the promise bestowed upon him.

The history of the patriarchs closes with the most comprehensive blessing, the prophetic announcement of the possession of Canaan by the twelve tribes, to which the blessing and adoption of Joseph's children are a preparation and introduction. The book then closes with the burial of Jacob in the promised land, and Joseph's command that his bones also should be carried there; and his last expression, "when God shall visit you and bring you back," includes the essence of the object of the book of Genesis.

With Joseph the preparatory part of the theocratic history ceases. The history passes over a large space of time until Moses; a history of Egypt and its rulers is not suitable to a narrative whose purpose is so much more exalted. How the people at this time received a *negative* preparation for the great counsel of God, is sufficiently indicated by the notices in Exodus. But here again the narrator has to do only with the history of the race of Israel, as the elect of God, and he therefore begins once more with the significant and blessed names of the twelve patriarchs. Only in this way could Genesis and Exodus stand in close relation to one another.

The *condition* of the people, sketched in a few striking outlines, is here the *history* of the people; but in the history of Moses from his earliest childhood, the intervention of the Lord's hand is again wonderfully displayed. The instrument by which the Theocracy

was to be established, must now be set forth; above all his *calling* must be clearly recognized, even as all that went before was a preparation for it, while it exercised the most essential influence on all that followed. It was not human will and choice, but only a call immediately proceeding from Jehovah that could here decide. Jehovah makes himself known to him by his significant name, while previously only the significant names of patriarchs and places of memorial had pointed to this centre of the revelations; and he gives him power to work miracles, which he had given to none before. Hence a detailed description of the manner in which Moses demeans himself in reference to these divine directions, was here unavoidably necessary, that we might know that the internal call of Moses was throughout opposed to his own natural disposition, and that nothing but subjection to the divine will impelled him to undertake his mission. The external position of Moses in relation to his people must also be clearly set before us, in order to give full proof and sanction to his office as well as that of Aaron, and the arrangement arising out of it for all future times; for which reason the genealogy is given, Ex. vi. 14, ff.[1]

The book then dwells not less fully on the mode in which the Lord glorifies himself in reference to Israel, and delivers them out of the land of bondage. Every day here becomes an everlasting evidence of divine grace, justice, and majesty. The fulfilment is still more glorious than the promise. The close is the reception of Israel as the covenant-people in the Feast of the Passover, which is the most solemn confirmation of the destruction of every God-opposing element, and of the reception of all who take his covenant upon them with a believing heart. In no other way could Israel obtain deliverance from Egypt, even as in no other way could they gain admission into Canaan. The Theocracy was the placing of a people immediately under the dominion of God as King; hence its fundamental thought is that of the immediate and real manifestation of God in the midst of his kingdom. Such a manifestation, however, is primarily antagonistic, rigidly annihilating everything that opposes its holy nature. Hence it is a point of essential importance to the Theocracy, that this opposition is *practically* expressed. This is done in the conquest and utter destruction of the heathenish

[1] See on this the excellent remarks of Ranke, p. 72, ff.

element, as that which is conceived to be in direct opposition to Jehovah, so soon as Israel, as the covenant-people, comes in contact with it.

Everything, therefore, now hastens on to the manifestation of God *in the midst* of his covenant-people. The development of this accordingly is introduced by the narrative. We do not here meet with a detailed catalogue of the stations of the people (Exod. xv. 22, ff.), but only those where Jehovah gave them a special mark of his care; and in the narrative Exod. xviii.,[1] which anticipates the course of the history, we have human arrangements markedly distinguished from the divine legislation which then begins, and the historical development of which thenceforth demands the greatest extent of the work.

Here follows now the promulgation of the Law itself, in which the adoption of the people as a nation of kings and priests is presupposed as the fundamental thought. In order to comprehend this development of the Law, its *idea* again must first be firmly laid hold of, which is then verified in the historical series of events. The opposition in which it has been shewn that Jehovah, as king of the Theocracy, stood to all that was untheocratic, could not receive the same *practical* exhibition in the Theocracy as out of it, for that would involve the destruction of the Theocracy itself. It could not here take effect in any other way than in *word, i.e.*, in the *Law*, the will of God objectively presented to man, which cannot, however, appear realised to that extent that the divine word and the divine act should coincide. But again, on the other hand, the divine word can never be conceived of as apart from the act, and hence this supposes another act of God limiting and restraining the rigorous character of the Law. This is the other side of the divine theocratic manifestation, the removal of the opposition that is called forth by the Law. Without being itself the fulfilment of salvation, the theocratic institution was the anticipation of this salvation by means of *the act*, that is, by emblem and type. The old covenant was therefore a real ordinance of salvation. The divine act is no mere appearance, but a communication full of life and power; it is this that connects this institution with the future, and makes it in its fulfilment an eternal one, as God himself is eternal.

[1] See Ranke, as above, p. 83.

Hence flows the internal and necessary combination of the moral and ceremonial law, the principle of which is expressed even in the Decalogue. Thus the ethical and dogmatical element mutually pervade each other. As they advance in an equal degree, the one could be represented only in its concrete unity with the other. Since the Decalogue as the fundamental law stands at the head of the rest, the objective nature of the Law, as well as its subjective character, is shewn to be the agreement of the sentiment with the action. Accordingly we have now to do with the practical carrying out of this principle, by which it was made to circulate through all the veins of the national life. This is done in the laws that immediately follow (Ex. xx. 19, xxiii.), which indeed at first affect only individual departments of the life of the people, but supply sufficient proof to what an extent the basis of the Law would form the root of a tree full of noble boughs and precious fruits.

This plan on which God proceeded with his people is of a genuine pedagogic character. He knows the deepest recesses of their heart, their stiff untractable disposition. A select deputation of the people must draw near to the manifested majesty of Jehovah, and a solemn sacrifice ratifies on both sides the covenant that has been concluded; and now for the first time Moses remains forty days with Jehovah, to receive his commands (c. xxiv.). The communication which he here receives relates to God's dwelling in the midst of the people, as was required by the theocratic institution, to verify the act of God as a *permanent* one. Here the internal unity of the Theocracy must come into view, its principle must appear in visible symbolic display. It receives a prominent exhibition also in the course of the description of the Tabernacle (c. xxv. ff.). First, the Holiest of all, uniting in itself the accusing Law, and the atoning symbol of divine grace, the middle-point of the whole, realising the reconciliation of God with the people, and exhibiting it immediately in its centre;—then, the Holy Place, representing the blessings obtained for the Theocracy by the Holiest of all and its atonement, a perpetual memorial of Israel's high destination, and signifying the means by which it must be reached;—the Forecourt, signifying the participation of the people in these blessings, and symbolizing their holy access to the Lord.

Thus this account begins with the Sanctuary, describing it from its middle-point (xxvi., xxvii.), and then passes on to the personal

agency employed, the *Priesthood;* and here again it is first shewn, according to its permanent symbolical character, as related to the Temple, what kind of vestments should be worn (c. xxviii.), then follows the form and manner of consecration to the office (c. xxix.). The description then proceeds to treat of the kind of *worship* that arises out of the preceding, the service of the priests in the sanctuary, of which the elementary outlines and proper nature are here indicated, as well as the two altars, that of burnt-offering (xxix. 36, ff.), and the altar of incense (xxx. 1—10), the former representing what is preparatory and inferior, the latter the complete and higher department of the priest's business. And in this all the people also must take part, giving their contributions and gifts for the ordering of it, which forms an appropriate close to the personal agency (xxx. 11—16.).

The nature and arrangement of the *utensils* required for the service of the priests appropriately follows next, such as the brazen bason for sacred ablutions, the preparation of the ointment and the incense (xxx. 17—38.). The appointment of those men might now take place, who were endowed with the Spirit of God to construct every thing belonging to the arrangements of the holy Tabernacle (xxxi. 1—11.).

After the sanctuary, the priesthood, and the worship, comes now the last requisite, the sacred time; which is here defined only in its fundamental principle, *the Sabbath*, which contains the rudimental conception of all the rest (xxxi. 12, ff.).

God having delivered the tables of the law to Moses, the execution of the building and the arrangement of the Tabernacle should now have begun. But the carrying out of this object is interrupted by the account of the idolatry of Israel and its punishment (xxxii. —xxxiv.) In opposition to that which is objectively performed on the part of Jehovah in the sight of Israel, the fearful subjective apostacy is now exhibited, a fact of prophetic significance, which is constantly repeated throughout the history of succeeding generations. This narrative is thus most intimately connected with the preceding: Jehovah's grace, the base ingratitude of the people, Jehovah's compassionate faithfulness, are so closely conjoined, as to form the fundamental thought of the whole theocratic history. The ample detail with which the occurrence is given is justified by this its internal significance, which invests it with an importance

far exceeding what it has in its immediate connection. Not till after this, therefore, does the execution of that which was historically subsequent, suitably come in, viz., the completion of the building of the Tabernacle (xxxv.—xl.); in which part the constant affirmation that every thing was done according to the commands of Jehovah, points to that which precedes, and that which follows is at the same time prepared for, since only the erection of the sanctuary is spoken of, so that the ordination and consecration of the priests, and the arrangement of the worship, must form the sequel.

With this then Leviticus begins. The laws of sacrifices form the commencement (ch. i.—vii.); in the first place we have their general nature; hence the division into bloody and unbloody offerings necessarily came in here (ch. i., ii.) Then comes the description of these offerings according to their objects (*thank-offerings, sin-offerings,* iii.—v.), and the time, place, and manner of their presentation (vi., vii.) This is followed by the actual consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood, and they are solemnly confirmed as mediators between Jehovah and his people by the manifestation of the divine glory (viii., ix.) But as formerly the people had been fearfully punished for their ingratitude, the same is now the case with the priests for disobedience; the account of which is followed by several laws relating to the requirements of the priestly office.

The fundamental law of the Theocracy, the theocratic holiness of the people, was essentially connected with the sanctuary, which was Jehovah's established residence in the midst of the people, "sanctified by His glory:" this testified by an external token the actual fellowship of God with his people. So must also all the accessories surrounding the sanctuary practically verify the strict distinction of holy and unholy arising out of it; the whole theocratic life must consist in a separation, consistently carried out, of all that was unclean from that which was clean, consecrated to God, and which, therefore, needed not avoid the neighbourhood of his sanctuary. Hence the description of the sanctuary, and what belongs to it, is followed by the laws concerning cleanness and uncleanness. Nature and all animal life in it must here, equally with man, furnish a testimony of their defilement by sin, and of the

opposite to that, the holiness of Jehovah (ch. xi.—xv.) This collective purity of the people had, however, its central point in the great sacrificial solemnity, when the whole people were to be purified, the sanctuary itself consecrated anew, and all sins taken away. Neither the offerings, which were before commanded, nor the laws concerning cleanness and uncleanness, could be represented as sufficient, nay, not even as practicable, were there not the day of atonement, the day of the general forgiveness of sins. The necessity, therefore, of such a day is pointed out by all that precedes, and thus ch. xvi. is quite in its proper place (comp. especially verses 30—34.) The sanctuary was now in a positive form made the centre of the whole nation, and it farther required only a negative admonition that all worship must maintain its relation to the sanctuary. Hence no offering must be slain, no bloody sacrifice, feast, &c., be prepared, except in the Temple. The root of all heathenish disorder was thus cut away, as everything was required to stand in immediate connexion with Jehovah and his worship (ch. xvii.)

The danger, however, of turning aside from the worship of Jehovah, was not so imminent while the people were secluded in the wilderness, as would especially be the case when they took up their residence in Canaan, in the midst of surrounding heathenism. Hence what follows in Leviticus refers to this important relation in which Israel would afterwards be placed; and thus the objection to the law, so far as delivered, namely, the impossibility of practically carrying it out in the new circumstances of Israel's position, is beforehand deprived of all force. At the same time it included positively the motive cause of Israel's separation from the Canaanites, the necessity of their extirpation, and consequently a clear representation of the whole position of the people of God in reference to heathenism. With this reference, the account in ch. xviii. begins with those transgressions affecting the whole people, in which it was chiefly exposed to heathenish influence, lewdness, contempt of parents, idolatry, &c. (ch. xviii.—xx.) But the priests in their private life should set the example in this, maintaining the strictest conscientiousness, and thus evidencing their connection with Jehovah, which involved an abhorrence of all impurity (xxi. —xxii. 16.) Hence also the freedom of offerings from every

blemish, always with a reference to heathen customs[1] around them, is inculcated (xxii. 17—33.) But the Israelites would find the most powerful check to any such tendency in the occurrence of solemn religious assemblies, which, governing the mind of the people, gave to the whole of civil life a direction to the central point of their religion, and thus imparted to all their business and engagements the higher theocratic consecration. Hence the feasts (calculated properly only for Palestine), the appointment of which we find in Levit. xxiii., dividing the year into sacred epochs, and conferring on agricultural life, by their reference to the history of Jehovah's deeds, the peculiar character of theocratic consecration, in striking opposition to all heathen worship, which being directed solely to natural life, sought in that its principle and mystery. Then follows the law concerning the purity of the oil, and the faultless preparation of the shew-bread, whose contents connect it most naturally with ch. xxii. 17, ff., but which is here introduced more suitably after ch. xxiii., since it refers to what was there treated of, the agricultural circumstances of the Israelites in their reference to Jehovah (ch. xxiv. 1—9.)[2]

As on former occasions the living divine power of the law, in its practical execution, was exhibited in opposition to all self-willed resistance on the part of men, so also here. The opposition to everything in heathenism, and the injurious consequences of any kind of mixture with it, are practically displayed in the case of a man, the offspring of a mixed marriage (an Egyptian and an Israelitess): he curses Jehovah, and Jehovah gives command to stone him (xxiv. 10—24.)

In close connection with the appointments which are interrupted by this occurrence, only because of chronological order, stands the law of the sabbatic year and year of jubilee. This is the fulfilment of the declaration, that Jehovah is the possessor of Canaan, and that the whole people, as well as the land, is his inviolable, exclusive property[3]—again presented in contrast to all heathenish possession of the land. To this solemn announcement is fitly joined

[1] Comp. especially xxii. 24, "*in your land* ye shall not do so," with reference to the castration, connected with idolatry, prevailing there. Comp. vv. 25, 32, 33.

[2] Ranke (as above, pp. 108, 109) takes another view of the connection of these passages, which appears to me, however, too loose and unsatisfactory.

[3] Comp. xxv. 23, and Carpzov, appar. crit. p. 467.

the fundamental element of the whole law: Jehovah, the one only true and living God, blessing his people who are faithful to him and who lay his law to heart, and cursing all who despise him and transgress his laws. Thus the decided opposition, extending now through a series of laws, is here brought to its highest point—the most impressive inculcation of all that goes before (ch. xxvi.)

When in this way the fundamental idea, how far the Israelites, in accordance with their peculiar position towards Jehovah, should be possessors and lords of the land, had been defined and completely laid down, a closer definition might now be given of the law relating to individual possessions, which were vowed to Jehovah or already belonged to him (such as the first-born); hence now come the law of vows, devoting by a curse, and tithes, in which again we cannot avoid recognizing the reference, on the one hand, to the preceding (comp. xxvii. 17, 18, 21, 23, 24), and, on the other, to the future circumstances of the nation (comp. xxvii. 28, 29, and Josh. vi.)

Thus far every thing in the legislation had maintained a reference to the central point of the theocratic revelation, and had at the same time been sanctioned as the idea that should embrace and rule the future. The history now turns back again to the present, to the changes which the divine appointments had rendered necessary in the encampment. With this the book of Numbers begins. A numeration of the people is undertaken, and that with the special intention of separating the Levites and the men who were fit to bear arms from the rest, and thus to carry into effect the occupation of the land, as well as the divine appointment regarding the first-born, the property of Jehovah, in whose place the tribe of Levi was substituted. Hence the numeration here is undertaken with a precise reference to lineal descent; then the order of encampment is settled, and then the appointment and official duties of the Levites (ch. i.—iv.); in which the preceding enactments are not only in general presupposed as already made, but there is likewise a special connection with the last chapter of Leviticus (comp. iii. 47 with Levit. xxvii. 6.)

The camp being thus set in order, must now be cleansed from every thing impure in accordance with the previous laws of purification. The command, therefore, follows to exclude lepers, persons having an issue, and those defiled by the touch of a dead body.

The execution of this command, resting as it did on the previous legal principle, that Jehovah's abode and its environs must be holy, could now for the first time be performed (Num. v. 1—4.) After the life of the citizens and that of the priests had in this way received their just limits and position, some laws founded thereon might be carried into effect, touching the interference of the priests in the affairs of civil life. To this belong the cases, in which there was no near relative after the death of the person against whom a trespass had been committed, and then the restored property fell to the priests: the divine ordeal (or trial) in the case of the wife suspected of adultery, in which the priest exercised the intermediate judicial functions: the condition of the Nazarite, and the form which the priests were to use in blessing the people (v. 5—vi. 27.) These institutions presuppose the whole of the previous organization, and the benediction beautifully forms the conclusion of these laws, as a significant symbol showing that, through the whole institution of the consecrated caste, only salvation, grace, and peace should accrue to the people.

The people also display a willing heart to present the required gifts, which at Jehovah's command must be delivered to the Levites; hence it is only here that this narration also can first find its proper place in its historical connection. Jehovah then shows his faithfulness by speaking with Moses from the Holiest of all (ch. vii.), in accordance with the promise which he made, Ex. xxv. 22.

Not less significantly now, before the Levites enter on their office, is the manner of lighting the lamps in the sanctuary repeated (viii. 1, ff.), and by this the communication of divine grace in the Theocracy is powerfully recalled to the minds of the people, as that grace had now been glorified again in the selection of this tribe.[1]

Then follows a description of the feast of the Passover, which here occupies its chronological place, but required particular mention on account of its leading in this instance to special precepts concerning the participation of unclean persons, which could not be delivered till after the definitions that follow of theocratic cleanness and uncleanness (ix. 1—14.)

The narrative now passes on to the removal of the Israelitish

[1] Comp. with this the recognition of that significance in the symbol in Zechariah iv., and Hengstenberg upon it, Christol. ii. p. 55, ff.

camp from Sinai (ix. 15—x.), the detailed account of which is justified by the mention made of the wondrous manner in which the host was guided by the cloudy pillar (ix. 15, ff.—x. 11), and of the sacred directions, giving the signal of removal and battle, which were of such importance to succeeding times, because of the divine promises connected with them.

We might now look for a description of the march of Israel into the promised land, the event for which the preceding circumstances are the preparation. As on the one hand the farther account plainly has this object in view, it was on the other hand the more necessary to show what was the cause of their not entering at this time. Accordingly our book now informs us with great exactness, how, in spite of the unceasing forbearance of Jehovah, the people directly give another proof of their old stiff-necked insolence, and are guilty of insurrections against Jehovah in which even Miriam and Aaron take part, while Moses in all this is still faithful to his God, yea comes out of the painful conflict with more illustrious distinction (chs. xi., xii.)

Spies have been already despatched into the land, and it is here shown, just when every thing externally is ready for the seizure of Canaan, how little ripe the people are for so important a step. The tumult excited by the report of the spies is related very fully, as being the turning point of the theocratic history; and while on the one hand these chapters presuppose a knowledge of the whole preceding history, even to remarkable detail (as in xiv. 22, and see the expositors on that passage), on the other hand, by the declaration that the people should wander forty years in the wilderness, they embrace all that follows, and thus evidence the wonderful unity of this history.[1]

Immediately after this follow laws given in the wilderness. Even the frame, that encloses them, is remarkable and peculiar, owing to the apparently tautological repetition of the theocratic principle (comp. xv. 2, 13—16, 22, 23, 37, ff.) It impressively shows the unbelieving people, who had been condemned to a severe punishment, that the main present object of these laws was, to fill them with a lively conviction, that they did not on that account cease to be the covenant-people of Jehovah, but that they still continued to be

[1] See Ranke, as above, p. 119, ff.

the depositary of his revelation. All these commands, however, refer also to the future as well as the present, which not only testifies the truth of the divine promises, but imparts to the commands themselves an internal relation to the whole of the Torah, so that they appear integral parts of it. But especial importance belongs to the practical execution of the law, as is proved by the examples, Num. xv. 32—36, and ch. xvi., testifying the majesty of God which presides over his covenant-law, and the continued ingratitude of the people. These facts are then followed by new stringent laws, but all resting on the old ground, which, with a reference to the revolt of Korah, bear expressly on the priests and Levites and their mutual relation, the ground of which became clearly apparent, chiefly through a distinct apprehension of theocratic cleanness and uncleanness (see ch. xix.)[1]

The time of Israel's punishment in the wilderness certainly possesses a significant theocratic importance, but properly only when viewed in its entire aspect, not in its separate subjective parts. It is only God's dealings towards his people at this time that are important for the history of the Theocracy, the preservation of which rather than its development is here treated of. These are presented clearly and definitely enough in the five chapters that give the history of the thirty-eight years of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness; a larger space must not be expected for the generation that perished there. So much the more is the time of the fulfilment of the divine promises to be regarded as the most splendid conclusion of the Torah, the point that imparts to the history a truly theocratic interest. But here the most important facts are crowded together in such a way as to make it clear that no strength and power of Israel's own, but the same God who had promised it, had also obtained for them the land of promise as a possession by his grace and might.

By this time Miriam had died in the wilderness, and the fortieth year is completed. Israel has again come in sight of the promised land to the borders of Edom, where Moses and Aaron also fall into transgression, and soon after the latter dies. Eleazar succeeds in his place. Israel despatches ambassadors to the king of Edom, requesting a free passage, and receives a scornful refusal (ch. xx.)

1 Comp. Ranke, as above, p. 126—132.

All this is exactly accounted for by what has preceded: the dying out of the old generation, by the divine decree; Moses' own unbelief, by the long space of time, in which the mind might well sink and the hand become slack; the insolence of Edom, by its appearing as if Jehovah had forsaken his own people, (comp. xiv. 14, ff.) Israel, however, must go though all this experience that they may become strong in their God. This is immediately shown to be the case at Arad, a royal city of the Canaanites; Israel solemnly devotes the cities of this people to Jehovah, and Jehovah gives them the victory (xxv. 1—3); Edom's borders must be avoided, and the thoughts of Israel directed exclusively to Canaan. No testimony is more striking than that which is now given to the murmuring people, the significant emblem of the serpent; reminding them of man's original sin and guilt, and Jehovah's victory over these; pointing invariably to Canaan, the land of Jehovah. Israel now marches on with courage, even to the borders of the Amorites, singing songs of praise in honour of Jehovah, and through his power slaying the kings of Heshbon and of Bashan (ch. xxi.) But, in the plains of Moab, a still greater display of Jehovah's glory awaits the people; the heathen prophet of Mesopotamia, hired by the prince of Moab, must here, overcome by Jehovah, instead of cursing Israel, bless them and point to the ancient promises, which were given to the fathers: the bitterest enemies of the Theocracy must here, even in its lowest condition, pay their tribute to the renown of its king (xxii.—xxiv.)

Israel's God was not overcome by Balaam (ch. xxv., comp. xxxi. 16), but the people certainly were, whose own nothingness is clearly displayed in the narrative that follows of their being seduced into the impure idolatry of the Moabites and Midianites. The first assault of the people must therefore be directed against their seducers (xxv. 17, ff.), and the occupation of the land be thus effected. The land is, therefore, first divided among the several tribes, and in reference to this the people are numbered once more, and Joshua is appointed their leader;[1] but in this division Jehovah expressly reserves to himself his own rights, and Israel is required not to forget the sacrifices of the Lord, his Sabbath, his feasts and vows, which are therefore briefly repeated, enforced anew, and

[1] See Ranke upon this, as above, p. 136, ff.

completed (ch. xxx.) Now for the first time the struggle with Midian begins; everything here is done in prescribed legal order with the trumpets of the priests, the sacred purification, and the free-will offering of the booty to the sanctuary of Jehovah (ch. xxxi.)

That was the last work of an external nature in which Moses engaged (comp. xxxi. 2); his attention is now directed only to the internal concerns of his people, after having prepared everything for the completion of his work. The entrance into the land is now effected, and accordingly he divides it between Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh (ch. xxxii.) He then gives command, after once more significantly reminding them of the way in which God had led them in the wilderness, and of the forty years that were now finished (xxiii. 1—4), as to how they should take possession of the land (for which ch. xxxii. was a preparation); directs the extermination of the Canaanites and their idolatrous worship; fixes the extent of the land to be conquered, the mode of division, the cites of the Levites and those of refuge; and lastly, from a special historical occasion, gives the law, so important for the preservation of the property assigned, that female heirs must marry always in their own tribe (ch. xxxvi.)

Thus the eleventh month of the fortieth year had arrived, and now that the second generation was on the point of crossing the Jordan, the hour of Moses' departure was come,—since the promulgation of the law on Sinai, the most solemn moment of his life. He, the instrument of God at that time for the declaration of his will, could not depart hence, without completing this work of his. Therefore once more his last word, as a sacred legacy, goes forth to the people—but it is another than that which was uttered at Sinai. A prophetic spirit pervades these last discourses from the beginning to the end; the man of God is quite transported in spirit into the futurity of his people, and their fate stands disclosed before him. He commences with the mention of the wonderful leadings of Jehovah, which now come before his mind in the most lively manner; with the punishment of the people for their unbelief and obduracy, with the faithfulness of Jehovah in reference to all his promises, the fulfilment of which had now arrived; but knowing the way of this people and foreseeing their apostacy, he conjures them most earnestly to adhere to the statutes of the Lord, and

not to forget how he had revealed himself, otherwise instead of the blessing the curse would light upon them (Deuter. i—iv.)

In a second discourse, the subjective side of the law, its reception into the heart, is represented, both positively and negatively, with a masterly hand which, in a psychological respect, cannot be surpassed. The first effect of the law is fear, and that also is the intention of it; therefore, as Israel heard the fundamental law of the Theocracy with sacred dread, so should also each individual receive from it a lively impression of the divine holiness and majesty (ch. v.) But the essence of the law is love to Jehovah, the one true God; hence the incitement to be mindful of the divine compassion as testified by deeds, and thus it is this sentiment of love that first leads to a right and faithful performance of the law (ch. vi.) There were, however, two deviations by which the people were most likely to be led aside from the right path. The rigorous strictness of the law might easily incline them to a departure from Jehovah, and a compliance with that which was condemned even to the most secret emotions of the heart, namely, idolatry, that they might get rid of the hard and oppressive yoke of the law. Therefore, they are warned in the most impressive manner against the inhabitants and the idols of Canaan, with the assurance that, should Israel demean themselves like the heathen, they should be subjected to the same fate in being thrust out from the presence of Jehovah (chap. vii., viii.) The other not less dangerous path of error was that of self-righteousness, the vain-glorious idea that their own merit had achieved all that Jehovah had done for them. Therefore Jehovah says, "Not through thy righteousness and the purity of thine heart hast thou inherited the land of the heathen;" it is the free grace of Jehovah, and the sins of the people admonish them only too well how little it ought to be ascribed to themselves (ch. ix.) The history of the people, before and after the exile, represents these two forms of declension on a large scale; and while in the former period their idolatry, and in the latter their self-confident pride[1] bear witness to the deep truth of those warnings, they may be justly considered as embracing in a prophetic spirit the whole future history of the Theocracy.

"Therefore," continues Moses, "turn to that which Jehovah did for you, when he gave you the tables of the law, and instituted the ark

[1] [Or: "proud spirit of self-dependence"—der partikularistische Hochmuth.]

of the covenant and the priesthood, a significant symbol for you 'to circumcise the foreskin of your heart,' (x. 16), and to cherish his love in your inmost soul. Be mindful of Jehovah, the merciful and righteous God, whose blessing and curse shall be set before your eyes on Ebal and Gerizim, as an abiding memorial" (xi. 29.) By the mention of this fact, the Lawgiver was especially led to the life of the people when settled in their home. Regulations are therefore laid down for that life in laws which necessarily form, in accordance with this their intention, the supplement and completion of the earlier laws. Jehovah (they are told) will there point out to them a certain place for a permanent sanctuary, but every spot assigned to idolatrous worship shall be destroyed: in that place all sacrifices must be offered, though free permission was now given to slaughter animals in every place, as these were appointed for the food of the clean and the unclean (comp. Deut. xii. 14, ff., with Levit. xvii.); the earlier regulations concerning the eating of blood, and that which belonged to Jehovah, remaining however in full force. In general, the sanctuary must be constantly regarded as the central point for all sacred purposes; and on that very account too must the Canaanites be rooted out, and every idolatrous abomination utterly destroyed, for nothing may be added to the divine law or taken from it (ch. xii.) For the same reason, also, no false prophets and soothsayers, who turn away the minds of the people from the law, by setting up another law, must be suffered; nor is any city, which gives itself up to idolatry, to be spared, but destroyed with the edge of the sword (ch. xiii.) In like manner, they must not imitate any of the customs of the heathen in mourning, nor taste unclean animals, but faithfully follow in this the divine commands, and by a willing payment of the tithes, give proof of their attachment to Jehovah and his worship (ch. xiv.); for the same reason, they should also carefully observe the year of release, and the feasts of Jehovah (which, in reference to their celebration in the new sanctuary that should be chosen, receive more exact prescriptions; ch. xv., xvi.), and present none but unblemished offerings; for all idolaters should be inexorably subjected to the punishment of stoning. The land must therefore be governed by just judges, but the supreme tribunal shall be in the place of Jehovah's selection, consisting of the priests and the *Shophet* of the land: should a king be chosen by the people, he

should, above all, be directed by the divine law, and not live in heathen fashion. Along with the royal or judicial office, the priestly office should exist in its full rights, and along with this again the prophetic (ch. xvii., xviii.) But with all this the duties of the Judges are strictly defined; for Jehovah will not in his land suffer the right of the innocent to be perverted, or indulgence to be shown to the evil-doer (ch. xix.) Then come the laws of war for Israel, delivered with reference to what was immediately at hand, the conflict with the Canaanites, as the most important of all wars with the heathen, and at the same time the rule for all future wars (ch. xx.); and then follows a series of laws, which, presupposing those that were earlier given, refer chiefly to difficult judicial decisions, and represent the whole of civil life as pervaded by the strictest application of the ideas of theocratic law and duty. Hence that form of prayer is finely introduced as the close of the whole, which, at the presentation of the first fruits and the tithes, expressed the theocratic confession of faith, by which every Israelite should know and acknowlege himself to be that which his God had called him to be. This conclusion gives a noble completeness to the peculiar character of Deuteronomy as relating to the subjective life of the individual (ch. xxvi.)

That contrast which the whole of the law contains, namely, the blessing and the curse of Jehovah, previously only alluded to, but requiring to be powerfully brought home to the consciousness of the people at their entrance into Canaan, is now set forth exactly in its particulars, as that solemn covenant-act which was just about to be performed. With this is connected the description of the delightful fulness of these blessings, and all the fearfulness of the divine anger. The prophetically alluring and warning voice of the greatest of the prophets of the Old Covenant puts forth still more energy, the prospect extends still farther into the more distant future of the consecrated nation, until at last, in the most wonderful flight of inspiration, surmounting lamentation and complaint, and rising to the most elevated announcement of the divine salvation, it closes in a genuine song of triumph.

The history of the law concludes with an appendix concerning the end of him, who was deemed worthy to deliver it to Israel.

§ 7. ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS AND FRAGMENTS IN THE PENTATEUCH. HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE HYPOTHESES RESPECTING THESE.

Whether the author of the Pentateuch has founded his work on written documents or oral tradition, has been a question possessing particular interest in reference to that part of the history which precedes the age of Moses, consequently to the whole book of Genesis, and was thus early brought under discussion. Vitringa brought forward the opinion, "*schedas et scrinia patrum, apud Israelitas conservata, Mosem collegisse, digessisse, ornasse, et ubi deficiebant, complesse.*" In reference to this, he laid particular stress on the superscriptions זה ספר אלה תולדות, &c., and appealed to such passages as Gen. xviii. 17, 18 (Obss. S. i. c. 4, p. 36, sq.) To this general supposition of originals, belonging to the ante-Mosaic period, which the author of Genesis had before him, other enquirers, even till very recently, were contented to adhere, without attempting a more exact indication of them. Others, however, sought to define more exactly the *nature* of the originals, and thus a wide field was opened for the indulgence of the love of hypothesis. In general two ways were chosen. 1. Some, thinking it improbable that written documents should previously have existed, conceived they would be enabled at once to comprehend and explain better the mode of narration, by substituting in place of written documents, hieroglyphical monuments and ancient picture-writing.[2] This view was applied especially to the first chapter of Genesis, and its supporters went so far as to give exactly the original form of the ancient memorial, and to find the author guilty of incorrect interpretation, &c.[3] 2. The rashness and arbitrariness of this hypothesis, which may now be considered as quite exploded, could not but be soon remarked. Through a closer consideration of the contents of Genesis in particular, other enquirers set about examining whether the original form of these documents might not be made out from the

1 Comp. Richard Simon, hist. crit. V. T. i. c. 7, Clericus. diss. de script. Pent, § 2, who says, Qualia et quot fuerint ea scripta ii demum dixerint, qui iis temporibus vivebant, si ad vitam revocarentur;—Jahn, Introd. ii. p. 95, ff.; Rosenmüller, scholl. p. 44, sq. Pareau de myth. c. 5, intp. p. 172, sq. instit. p. 112.

2 Comp. especially Otmar (Nachtigall) in Henke's Magazin ii. p. 512 ff. On the other side Eckermann, Beitr. v. i. p. 155 ff. Vater, Comment. on the Pent. iii. p. 688 ff.

3 See the literary notices in Hartmann, p. 76, ff.

way in which they were put together, and from their tenor. In reference to this, the production of Astruc[1] in particular made a great noise. According to him, two main originals are to be distinguished in Genesis, which may be known from one another by their respective employment of the names *Jehovah* and *Elohim* in speaking of God. But, in addition to these, ten other documents also are found, which, being foreign to the first two, must be proved to be interruptions of the history, interpolations, &c. These different portions were not originally connected, but were first mingled together by the fault of transcribers. J. D. Michaelis in particular gave much countenance to this hypothesis, and adopted it under certain modifications.[2] But it was Eichhorn principally who was led by it to subject the component parts of Genesis to a more careful examination.[3] Setting out with the discovery of single independent documents, he strives to show that the greatest part of the composition is made up of the pieces of two historical works, which, proceeding from two different authors, are to be known by their variation in the names applied to God. This view was received by his contemporaries with the greatest approbation, and gained advancement through the work of K. D. Ilgen, "The original documents in the archives of the Temple at Jerusalem. First part, Halle 1798. 8," which took up the supposition of two *Elohistic* documents and one *Jehovistic*, the second Elohist frequently approaching the Jehovist in language and character. This document-system was carried still farther more recently by Gramberg (libri Geneseos secundum fontes rite dignoscendos adumbratio nova, Lips. 1828), which proposes to distinguish three component parts of Genesis, one Jehovistic, and one Elohistic, which however have been more or less arbitrarily worked up and enriched with additions by the compiler (as in xix. 29, xx. 18. &c.) Stähelin also (in "Critical enquiries concerning Genesis. Basil, 1830), still holds to the notion of two documents, which have been brought into agreement by the reviser; except that where the statements of facts have differed, he[4] gives them from both

[1] Conjectures sur les memoires originaux, dont il parait qui Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse. Brux. 1753. 8 (in German, Frankf. 1783.)

[2] Introd. i. § 52, p. 267, ff.

[3] Introd. iii. § 407—417.

[4] [*i. e.* The supposed reviser or editor of the documents —TR.]

authorities, and in such a way that it is clear he regarded them as giving an account of different occurrences.

Meanwhile, subsequently to the hypothesis of Eichhorn, the view entertained of the Pentateuch in general had become decidedly opposed to the belief of its genuineness. It was thought suitable to place the document-hypothesis in connection with this view, which was done by a two-fold modification of it. The unity of Genesis was given up; the separation of its parts, however, was confined to the distinction of certain narratives running on parallel to one another: there was only one step farther to be taken in giving up even this connection, to have instead of documents only fragments, mere abrupt isolated pieces, possessed of no internal connection, but strung together with verbal exactness. It is not Genesis only, however, that has met with this treatment, but it has been said that every book of the Pentateuch is composed of several separate pieces unconnected with one another; and that in all of them we have to do with several authors, and their pieces produced at different periods.[1] This supposition accordingly is closely allied with the earlier document-hypothesis; it shares also the same arguments with it, and gives them only another turn. Hence it need not seem strange that De Wette, according to his complete view of the Pentateuch, has formed a kind of compromise between the two schemes, inasmuch as recognizing the fragmentary conjunction he supposes an original plan and connection in the Elohistic portions, while the Jehovistic do not admit of being easily joined into a certain unity, and are perhaps derived from several sources.[2] Hartmann also (l. c. p. 169, ff.) attempts to point out an internal disconnection of parts in the Pentateuch—dismembered pieces proceeding from different authors.

It cannot surprise us that the endeavour which had been carried so far, to resolve the Pentateuch in part even into the smallest constituent portions, should, even where it was opposed, be followed in this its aberration from the truth by fresh aberrations. To these belong particularly Kelle's[3] supposition of an original well-connected

[1] So Vater, as above, p. 421, ff., following in the steps of an unknown writer in Henke's Magazine vi., p. 221, ff.

[2] Beiträge z. Einleitung in d. A. T. Bd. 2 (Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament, vol. 2nd); Introd. § 150, ff. With this Ewald also very much agrees, Studien und Kritiken; 1831, 3, p. 597, ff.

[3] "Unprejudiced estimation of the Mosaic Writings." Freiberg, 1812, 3d No.

document, which, however, at a later period was enlarged by manifold interpolations; and Bertholdt's opinion that the section, ch. v.—xxxiii., forms the original substance of Genesis, but that this has undergone subsequent enlargement, while the rest of the books were brought into their present form by various collectors.[1] But, on the other hand, there has been no lack of solid and well-grounded opposition to the modern rage for hypothesis: in this respect particular distinction is due to Ewald, "Composition of Genesis, Brunswick, 1823" (which has since, however, been partially retracted by the author), Ranke, "Researches concerning the Pentateuch. 1st vol. Erlangen, 1834." These researches have also produced an undeniable reaction upon the latest enquiries; so that *e. g.*, Schumann (Gen. Hebr. et Gr. Prolegg. p. lxviii.) supposes as sources of Genesis, "traditio scripta, trad. ore propagata, ingenium auctoris;" and even Von Bohlen, though he favours the view that an original Elohistic source has been re-touched by a later reviser, yet declares that it is not allowable for us to dismember the text and separate the original writing from it (p. cliii., viii., ff.); while that which was so much the subject of earlier discussion has evidently lost for him almost all weight and interest.

§ 8. GENERAL EXAMINATION OF THE FRAGMENT-HYPOTHESIS.

If we examine more closely the reasons by which it has been attempted to support this view, the following present themselves as the principal.

1. "The *superscriptions*, the forms of commencement זה ספר אלה תולדות, תולדות and such like, as signs that something new commences, are evidences of the disjunction of certain parts in the Pentateuch. The forms of conclusion, showing the end of a piece, lead to the same result. Levit. vii. 37, 38, xxvi. 47, &c."[2]

(*a.*) The concession is made, however, that the mere use of the superscriptions does not in itself warrant any such conclusion. But the custom of all simple historiographers, and especially the total want of art in the style of the Pentateuch, speak too evidently against

1 Introd. iii p. 834—847.

2 See Vater, p. 397, 398. Hartmann, p. 169—181.

such a supposition, since superscriptions of this kind are here quite in their proper place as transitions.[1] The argument is then given up when it is added that the nature of the passage, at the head of which the superscription stands, must also be taken into account in order to decision; recourse is thus had to a new ground, so that the other is voluntarily abandoned.

(*b.*) Every superscription or form of conclusion certainly marks the commencement of a new passage in the narrative; the attention of the reader is thus fixed on a definite object which he is firmly to retain in its distinct and separate individuality. But it is not at every important occurrence, as a rhetorical form, that the Pentateuch employs its superscriptions and forms of conclusion: the use of them is restricted to two cases. (*a.*) One is in relation to chronology; which, as we have already seen, is connected with genealogy and memorable occurrences: now each genealogy demands diplomatic exactness, provided it lays claim to historical fidelity, and still more if it professes to supply the thread or scaffolding of the historical account. Hence the author repeats those formulas most frequently in the genealogies themselves. Num. iii. 1—5 the אלה is three times repeated before תולדות and שמות; the same is the case Ex. vi. 14—25, Gen. x., xxxvi., xlvi. This serves to make the genealogies more clear and intelligible. But at the same time also their importance thus appears in relation to what goes before and follows, as points of support for the whole history. Through the narrator's having given in Exod. vi. 14, ff., the genealogy of the three eldest sons of Jacob with such exactness, he can then expressly continue: "This is that Moses and Aaron" (according to their descent), vi. 26, 28. In Genesis this is of still more importance. There all the genealogies stand in exact chronological connection; one is the continuation of the other. Had the author joined them together, as the chronicler has done, 1 Chron. i., ff., he would in like manner have begun straightway: אנוש, שת, אדם, and might have satisfied himself with the internal connections of the families; but now he was concerned to link them with the history; how then could he dispense with the indication supplied by the superscription, when a genealogy as such can never continue the narrative, but rather inter-

[1] See the examples in Ewald, Compos. of Gen. p. 133: Stähelin, Researches, p. 10.

rupts it? (*β.*) With this use of them another is connected, not less of a diplomatic nature: we call it the juridical use. A law requires to be stated with particular clearness and distinct prominence, that it may be apprehended in its definite aim, be exposed to no misinterpretation, and receive close attention. In this also we see a certain connection with the chronological intention of the formulas, Levit. vii. 37, 38 (comp. xxvii. 34, iv. 30, xxxvi. 13; Deut. iv. 45), where the close of the ordinances given at Sinai is spoken of. But much more frequently this reference is abandoned, and the form is turned into a simple announcement that a law follows or concludes there. Hence the forms that are so current, "זה קרבן", "זאת תורת", &c. These forms then everywhere display a definite and well-known intention on the part of the author, standing in exact relation to their object: consequently we have here the very opposite of disorder, dismemberment, or fragmentary arrangement.

(*c.*) This is clear also from the nature of the superscriptions themselves. From such passages as Num. i. 5, ff., where the אלה שמות stands in the middle of a speech of Jehovah, it is plainly apparent how little apprehension the author has that the unity, the internal conjunction of the whole, would be destroyed by it. Besides, could he otherwise begin with a simple ואלה, as in Gen. x. 1, xxxvi. 1, xlvi. 8, so plainly indicating by the copula the transition and conjunction?

Farther, the expression תולדות signifies *history of the origin*,[1] hence the reference to genealogy prevails in it equally with the reference to historical description. The word never stands for *history* or *memoir* in general,[2] for then it could not be applicable to genealogies; nor simply for *families, generations*, for Gen. ii. 4 can only mean, "The history of the origin of the heavens and the earth." By this very expression the narrator points our attention to the circumstance that he intends everywhere to give the *origines rerum*, and constantly to go back to them; hence he begins at once with the creation as the first תולדות, with which all the rest have their commencement, and to such primary beginnings in accordance with the peculiar object of his plan he must

1 Just as *γένεσις* does. The word is thus distinguished from מולדת, in the same way that תוצאות and מוצא are related to each other.

2 As Hartmann (l. c. p. 171) however will have it.

reduce every thing else. Thus he connects his history by this expression in a peculiar manner: in Genesis this was everywhere necessary; for there nothing else is spoken of but the preservation of the original race, and the exclusion of all the rest; but he also continues in this way. Mention has long been made of Moses and Aaron; but the author must come back to their origin, and hence he gives quite consistently their תולדות, Num. iii. 1. Thus here also the expression has the effect of connecting, just in the same way as שמות, ראשים, פקודים show that *names, heads of tribes, reviews,* of the mention of which the preceding history supplies the occasion, are to be the subjects of discourse. Hence the author also at the beginning of his תולדות declares that now a ספר "תו commences v. 1, since he goes back again to the primitive history, beginning with Adam.[1] This expression accordingly embraces all that precedes as forming a connected cycle of occurrences, attaching these occurrences to the most important persons, and bringing them once more into view—(the author could not give this information sooner, for he would then have been unintelligible), —and as the statement opens thus, "now begins the book of the origin of Adam," and this genealogy is continued as far as to Noah, it conjoins in the fittest manner the events of ch. vi. with those that go before. Besides, the author in this way gives an excellent indication of the plan and disposition of what follows, since he continues the ספר "תו in additional new תולדות, which, according to his aim, should form *a whole,* a ספר.

2. An appeal is made to the *isolation* of those portions of the Pentateuch, which appear to be inserted without any connection with the preceding or following context.[2]

This mode of procedure also bears internal evidence of a want of critical judgment. If we should take it upon us to pronounce a decision according to a purely objective and absolute standard, on the mode and fashion in which the historian must work up his matter in a proper way, and give it the internal connec-

1 Hence the express addition: "on the day that God created man." The *Toldoth* of the creation are accordingly here taken up again. Hartmann has quite misunderstood the passage, p. 174, when he translates: "this is a (written) family register." We may then certainly ask: "were not also the other sections of Genesis written memorials?" A question which just shows the impropriety of that explanation.

2 See Vater, p. 397. Hartmann, p. 181, ff.

tion that belongs to it, so that the unity of his person and his work may be deduced from it, we should unquestionably go wrong. We should also have to pay regard in the first place to the custom of his age and country; and in the case of the Pentateuch neither of these admits of that view. For while the East in general is little concerned[1] about that connection in an historical account that is externally manifest, being expressed in the verbal composition, still more must this be affirmed in general of a writing which reaches back into so high an antiquity as ours does. We willingly concede that in the matters related, in the subject itself, this connection of the individual parts must necessarily appear, and hence that even where a formal connection is wanting, a material one must be shown. This requirement, we believe, we have already satisfied by pointing out the internal connection of facts. Farther, along with this, the nature of the historical materials themselves must be regarded. In the Pentateuch this is in general of two kinds; the one consisting of facts, and containing narrations of events, the other legislative. In the case of the former, we must evidently make stricter demands than in that of the latter. Abrupt facts thrown together without regard to the chronology, and without the statement of causes to account for them, certainly speak against the unity of an historical work. But we find just the opposite of this in the Pentateuch. It is incontrovertibly certain that its collective narratives refer to a definite idea which lies at the foundation of the whole; and that they are properly connected, may likewise be pointed out. This is manifest from the relation of the legislative part to the historical. The law, from its nature, is a separate thing, distinctly marked off: its character is precisely that of a certain isolation; yet we have seen above that the element of fact is here most intimately conjoined with the legal element, so that the explanations supplied by the former are frequently the vouchers that verify the latter, which itself in turn is not presented as a body or code of laws, but advances in historical development. But, lastly, it should also not be forgotten what was the origin of an historical work,—under what circumstances it was called forth. These also in the case of the Pentateuch are of a peculiar kind. According to its own statements, the work cannot have been produced at one time. It rather required a series of years for its completion. In speaking of the

1 Compare remarks on this by Ewald, l. c. p. 139, ff.

time of its production, we wish to guard against arbitrary embellishment in reference to the composition and the author, as *e. g.* much has been said of disturbances and interruption caused by his labours. But it is incontestably manifest, that as the representation must stand in a certain harmony with the course of events, a degree of isolation in certain parts of the narrative must be the necessary consequence.

Principal stress, however, is laid on the *breaks* which are found in the historical account. But how if it may be shown that just those periods of time of which no notice is taken, such as the private life of Moses, and the sojourn in the wilderness, did not belong to the plan of the narrator? Or is it not of much more consequence to see whether the section, where the break begins, and a new commencement of the narrative occurs, does not stand in close relation to what goes before, as *e. g.* Exod. i. joins on closely with the conclusion of Genesis? Such breaks, on the contrary, are rather proofs of the plan, which the narrator kept before him through the whole of his work without ever abandoning it. It is just in this that his combination of the events is manifestly shown and verified; he gives us nothing that does not belong to his subject, and therefore nothing that is isolated, but only what is mutually related.

3. The *repetitions* also are adduced, which are to be found in the accounts given of the same matter, and are taken as a proof that the author worked upon various authorities that lay before him, and put them together.[1]

That which was brought forward by way of example to this effect, required the exercise of careful discrimination; but instead of that, the most heterogeneous instances imaginable have been brought together. A considerable part of them belongs to the essential nature of Hebraism, to the oriental method of writing history; so that, before such an assertion can be maintained, the Hebrew style of narration must be totally mistaken. Sometimes we have the animated discourse rising even to poetical flights; sometimes the interruption of the discourse, and its re-connection with the preceding; sometimes the purpose is to direct the reader's attention continuously to a certain object; sometimes the repeti-

1 See Vater, p. 398. Hartmann, p. 188, ff.

tion is founded in the nature of the thing, and to be explained on internal grounds;[1] *e.g.* psychological, Exod. vi., or historical, as in the case of the oft-repeated promises and laws.

4. Of still less importance is the last ground, which is derived from the *diversity* of the statements given of the same occurrence.[2] Here also it is in fact only the examination of individual instances that can lead to a conclusion. But it merits observation that this argument really abandons the proper ground of discussion, and passes over to another, namely, that of the history itself, and its whole character. Hence recent writers, as Von Bohlen, exercising a clearer perception in respect to this, put that diversity to the account of the inaccuracy, and the mythical or traditionary character of the narrative. For the mythus or tradition is in its nature manifold; it is a plant of rank growth, spreading in all directions, which assumes the most multifarious forms; while history, on the other hand, has the characteristic of unity; it is the one true thing, with which, as the permanent foundation, all the rest is joined only as that which does not belong to it, and must be sifted from it. The charge therefore immediately affects not the representation, but that which is represented, the thing itself that is narrated. In doing so, however, the strange blunder has been committed of deciding beforehand: "these occurrences are one and the same,"—without considering the contradiction involved, when it is added: "but they are diversely related," for it is just this diversity that may easily be reconciled with the *similarity* of the facts, but not with their *identity*. And it is precisely the proof of the identity of the occurrences, which is the real main-point of the argument, that has always been supposed, but not demonstrated.

To turn, however, from these main points of support, let us consider in what way and manner the maintainers of the fragmentary formation imagine the work has originated. For though Vater goes no farther than the mode of collection, in which the collector or collectors of the fragments have discharged their task, this plainly cannot satisfy us. As little will Hartmann's notion suffice, who conceives the whole has originated in the most external cir-

[1] Comp. Rosenmüller, scholl. i. p. 48. Ewald as above, p. 144, ff.

[2] See Vater, p. 408, 428, and alib. Hartmann, p. 199, ff.

cumstances, through pure caprice of the collector, mere chance (one roll perhaps having been left partially empty!) association of ideas, &c. It may be that the persons who devoted themselves to such an employment, went to work in this arbitrary and thoughtless manner,—but how then can we explain the *plan*, which all the recent writers also concede is found, in Genesis especially? And where can a similar proceeding be pointed out in any oriental historiographer (who must be one belonging to a literary period long subsequent)? But the chief matter is, whence have we those separate constituent parts, from which the collection has arisen? Those who have advanced this hypothesis have never considered what violent and extensive suppositions are involved in it. For we can hardly conceive that those larger pieces from which the fragments were taken, treated only single and abrupt portions of history; neither can each have left off exactly where another began: we are required to suppose that there was the most vigorous activity in the composition of primitive history among the Hebrews, —at some literary epoch, for which it is impossible to assign a place anywhere in the history, a phenomenon that is the more puzzling, as the literature that is known to us is linked in its collective form with the historical narrative that is known to us.[1] And now for the period of the collection itself. It can only have been after that independent literary activity, which no one will be so inconsiderate as to refer to the Mosaic age, had long ceased. If we fix perhaps on the time of the exile, how can it be reconciled with the circumstance that the men who are then so much engaged in collecting, as the Chronicler must necessarily have been one of them, know nothing more than what the Pentateuch presents to us in its present form? How can we charge that age generally with the boldness of arbitrarily cutting out, adding, and reconstructing so much? How shall we explain it to ourselves that the collecting historians of that later age constantly cite their sources of information with exactness, but never do this in the most important part of their national history?

But according to the assertion of a recent enquirer,[2] Vater's view is only the deteriorated form of an earlier, simpler, and more

1 Comp. also the remarks of Sack, Apologetik, p. 158, ff.

2 Ewald, Studien und Krit. 1831, 3, p. 597.

correct one, the document-hypothesis: from that then we may perhaps succeed in obtaining more satisfaction.

§ 9. GENERAL EXAMINATION OF THE DOCUMENT-HYPOTHESIS. ITS FOUNDATION: THE NAMES OF THE DEITY.

Before we examine in detail the possibility of resolving the Pentateuch into its separate elements, we must form a general estimation of the view, according to which we possess in Genesis and Exodus continuous and subsequently interwoven documents. Considered in itself, it is quite a natural idea that in giving an account of former times a writer keeps to ancient documents and borrows his matter from them. Supposing that, as far as Genesis is concerned, the historical matter of that primitive period may and must be regarded as derived principally from the faithful tradition of tribes and families, it is yet only natural to think that some individual writings of that period lay before the composer of the work. However poor we may regard the literary stores of that period, however much fidelity and weight we may attribute to oral tradition, that supposition is still not excluded by it. For the need of written tradition is felt most powerfully when we are threatened with the loss of oral tradition, or with its falling into uncertainty. We cannot, however, point out an epoch in the history, when the patriarchal traditions of the family of Jacob were threatened with danger in that respect by a mental revolution among them, earlier than the commencement of the new period of the theocratic legislation. For the transition of the family into a people cannot be looked upon as such, since the change was certainly a gradual one; while the nation itself existed in a constant state of separation from others, and was as far as possible from losing the consciousness of its nationality. Thus the *a priori* probability as to that being the epoch does not in any way amount to certainty.

But where external data are wanting, internal signs may perhaps decide all the more surely. But in this also it is an important distinction which has long been less regarded than it ought, that a history may very well be represented in general as taken from written sources, without our being therefore in a condition to point out these sources in individual detail, to separate them, and definitely

describe their character. For our part we keep the two investigations quite distinct and apart from each other; and while the latter entangles us in the labyrinth of hypotheses, the former might be very well calculated to lead us out of it without the risk of partiality. There is, besides, one circumstance which appears to demand the exercise of all the more caution. Nowhere in the whole of Genesis do we find any kind of trace of quotations from any source whatever. This circumstance in itself might appear insignificant; but it acquires particular importance from the comparison of the other monuments of the historical literature of the Hebrews. In the course of our investigations in reference to this we shall always find it a safe canon, that the written sources of information, where such formed the groundwork, are everywhere named by the authors; but where such intimations are wanting, we have to do with contemporary accounts. This circumstance gains more weight from our remarking, that in Num. xxi. 14, the author of the Pentateuch expressly names another work, from which he adduces a passage. If he did so in this one case, why not on other occasions? But when considered more closely, even this circumstance is not decisive. For we might certainly have here not verbal extracts from works, but merely the employment of them, an adaptation of them to a definite end, so that on that account the compiler might not only think it unnecessary to name any authorities, but even feel himself under the necessity of naming none. Thus a similar course is pursued, certainly at a much later period—but in this the East has doubtless remained very much the same—by the Chronicler, 1 Chron. i.—ix., where he certainly borrows his genealogies, but adapts them to a definite purpose. But then the difficulty presents itself in a still higher degree, of deciding concerning the authorities employed, since a sure result can be obtained only where we meet with these in their exact and verbal authenticity. At the same time, however, the question then becomes of less consequence, since we must feel more interest in the matter that lies before us in its definite adaptation, than in its original relation to its sources.

If these sources are to be more exactly defined, their internal character must be strictly apprehended. The diversity of the names of God, *Elohim* and *Jehovah*, is brought forward as one of the most important of these criteria. By the proposal of such a principle, the investigation acquires a deeply interesting importance.

Viewing the matter in general, it might certainly be regarded as a divergence indicative of two authors, to use one appellation of God with a marked preference. We might, for example, think of the peculiarity which distinguishes Isaiah, in the use of the name קדוש ישראל and אביר applied to God.[1] Yea, we might be reminded in reference to these very names, *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, of the later books of the Old Testament, in which partly the former name is rarely found,[2] and where this very usage is the proof of a peculiar difference between certain books, as those of Ezra and Nehemiah.[3] In general, therefore, we could not regard it as quite improbable that one ancient document should employ the name *Elohim*, and another, the name *Jehovah*, with particular preference.

But we should err, were we to be satisfied with this purely empirical view. The names of God are as far as possible from being arbitrary appellations; they are the expression of religious conviction, and represent the relation of man to the Deity in general. Hence the use of them also constantly bears the stamp of a certain peculiar standing-point of the period or of the individual, which is unquestionably the case in the later books of the Old Testament. If we look exactly to the signification of these names of God, it is likewise impossible to overlook a definite usage of the language, and a diversity of sense in them; and the bare empiric assertion that both names are promiscuously employed, entirely leaves out of view that, in addition to all the fundamental difference contained in the original application of those words, both may be alternately used according to the different views taken by the author; and neglects also to make any enquiry into these views, which alone can furnish a result, since no proper meaning can be given to the use of two names of God in the same language that are quite synonymous, and their diversity is certain *a priori*. Now, in this respect the *form* of the two words is of special importance. The signification of the root of אלהים may remain disputed, but the form of the word, at any rate, clearly exhibits the relation of the Godhead to that which is plural, the expression of the Godhead in a plurality, its conception in that manner; which, however, by no means contains Polytheism as such, for this plurality can never have for

1 See Kleinert, on the genuineness of Isaiah, i. p. 221, ff. 231.

2 See Gesenius, Thes. ling. Hebr. i. p. 97.

3 See Kleinert, in the "Dörpt'sche Beitr. z. d. theol. Wissensch." i. p. 122, ff.

its basis but a concrete unity, while Polytheism always presents in plurality the single individuals and the exaltation of each to a concrete unity, thus effecting its own destruction. But it must also be said that the idea of this word does not express the direct positive opposite of Polytheism. The true unity of God does not consist in a mere abstraction from plurality to unity: this unity must assume a concrete form, and the idea of God become that of a personal subsistence, the living God. This is brought fully into view in the idea of *Jehovah;* a name which consequently denotes the essence of the Godhead in its concrete relation to mankind, the revelation of the living God himself, which is as much unique as its object is unique:[1] an appellation which is so far from having come into Hebrew from an extrinsic quarter, that, on the contrary, it contains in itself the proper objective ground of the theocratic institution, thus finding its etymology only in the Hebrew language and mode of thought, to which it has been imparted as the revelation of the divine nature in this name.

If we now take into connection with this significance possessed by the names of God, the whole system of religious views belonging to the primitive age of the Hebrews, it is manifest at once that we must not regard the idea of Jehovah as one that would naturally be developed from the bent of the people's mind. The natural tendency of man's mind is, partly to lose itself in a plurality of Gods, partly to unite this plurality again, *i. e.*, to form an abstraction out of it. The concrete idea of God is found only where there is a living revelation of God, where man is conscious of personal communion with HIS God. Now, that is the characteristic of Hebrew antiquity, that in it the Godhead is אֵל חַי, a living God,[2] who stands in the most definite relation to one race (זֶרַע), which acquires and maintains its internal unity only through this relation. This antiquity, indeed, appears as the preparation for the institutions of later origin, which are certainly an advance upon it; but it also necessarily contains the special revelation of God, as Him who is the proper theocratic king of Israel; and from this point of view we cannot admit of a mere conception of God as Elohim being entertained, without perverting the very nature and distinctive mark of that primitive period.

1 Gen. xvi. 14, xxiv. 26, xxv. 11.

2 [The *object* here means, *the object revealed, i.e.*, God.—TR.]

In this also lies the questionable character that attaches to the supposition of an original document, which represented God from an exclusively Elohistic point of view. It would thus assume a position so entirely different, that the whole of the primitive age would be presented in it in quite another light than in the Jehovistic document; and then comes the difficulty of comprehending how they should be made to form in the hands of a collector so beautiful a whole. Yet there is so much truth in the hypothesis, that, before the establishment of the Theocracy, as it was founded by Moses, a more extensive and frequent use of the name *Elohim* might very well obtain, and indeed in a certain degree must have done so. But all this is still far from leading us to a belief in particular documents, exclusively containing that name.

To this must be added, that, in an historical respect, the Pentateuch itself puts us sufficiently in a condition to decide concerning the early use and signification of the name *Jehovah*, which is a point of consequence with regard to the rest of the names of God. In Exod. iii., on the occasion of the solemn calling of Moses, God names himself the God of the Patriarchs (ver. 6), whom the author immediately names *Jehovah* (ver. 7). He promises Moses to be with him (אהיה עמך, ver. 12), and, when Moses hesitates, he adds, אהיה אשר אהיה, ver. 14, *i. e.*, "I will shew myself to be (while I am with thee) what I am,[1] and it is significantly added, "he who has spoken this אהיה, that אהיה has sent me." The name of God *Jehovah* is here evidently presupposed as already in use, and is only explained, interpreted, and applied. In what follows, likewise, the discourse is constantly of Jehovah, the God of the Patriarchs, vers. 15, 16, 18; and therefore it was only the significance of this ancient name that had to be brought before the people, that they might know how much they possessed in it. It is certainly not a new name that is introduced; on the contrary, the אהיה אשר אהיה would be unintelligible, if the name itself were not presupposed in it as already known. The old name of antiquity, whose precious significance had been forgotten and neglected by the children of Israel, here as it were rises again to life, and is again brought home to the consciousness of the people. If we look now at the *meaning* of the name, we readily perceive that the

1 The expression contains the idea of the Absolute one: see Tholuck upon it, and the other expositors of Ep. to Rom. ix. 15.

author does not assign it so much the abstract idea of eternal existence, as that rather of the concrete existence of God, and his disposition towards Israel, his permanent close relationship to them.[1] Hence for one thing it follows, that as the author of the Pentateuch had distinctly in his view the full sublimity of the meaning of the word, we accordingly must necessarily expect from him a use of it conformed to rule; and also that in an historical respect he should have a clear discernment of the relation of this name to antiquity. In the latter respect, the connection between the former passage and ch. vi. 2, ff., is very important. The more evident it is, that this passage has a retrospective reference to the former, and presupposes the explanation there given of the name of Jehovah (without which supposition its pregnant brevity would render it quite unintelligible), the less shall we dare to believe ourselves justified in determining that there is a contradiction between the two. The meaning of the latter is, that God revealed himself to the Patriarchs as *El Shaddai*, and as such entered into a covenant-relation with them, but "as to my name Jehovah, by that I was not known to them;" *i. e.*, the signification of that name was by no means known to them in the way that it is known, now that it has been disclosed. And indeed that revelation was far from being a merely theoretical one: it went hand in hand with the practical revelation, the new glorification of God in his people. (Comp. Hos. xiii. 4.) Not until that fact had an historical existence could it clearly appear what that name contained in it; not till then could its proper complete sense be apprehended. From this then it follows, that even here it is by no means denied, that the name was in use in the time of the Patriarchs, but this is conceded in a limited sense, inasmuch as the full compass of its meaning could not be presented sooner than the Mosaic period.

But if it should be thought that the Mosaic period received the name first from a foreign quarter, an error would be committed. For should we perchance fix on Egypt, as was formerly done, all the historical data[2] that should prove it are in that case wanting;

1 As appears from vers. 7 and 8, and especially the expression in ver. 12, which has not been enough regarded אדוני עמק: comp. Baumgarten-Crusius Bibl. Theol., p. 108. Nitzsch, System d. chr. Lehre, §61. What mistakes have been produced by overlooking this idea, is shown by Vatke, Bibl. Theol. i., p. 672.

2 Comp. Tholuck, in the Liter. Anz. 1832, Nr. 28—30, with whom Vatke, l. c. p. 669, agrees.

and those traces of an origin of the name elsewhere, which it has been attempted to find, turn out to be still more defective.[1] But what is most opposed to all this is, that the name, according to the derivation given in Exod. iii., is of thoroughly Hebrew origin;[2] and that we must here also necessarily take into account the principle, so essential in all mythological inquiries, that the native and national home of a deity should be assigned to that people, whose language supplies the readiest explanation of his name.[3]

On the whole, we can hardly conceive of a document, which, according to its entire decided aim, is occupied with the subject of the manifestation of Jehovah, without containing this characteristic name of God. If there even had been such a writing, then, supposing it formed a consistent whole in agreement with this fundamental view, it would have been totally unsuitable for our author's purpose. Whether, in that case, he revised it, is in fact a matter of indifference to us, since, by undergoing such a change, it would become his own, and the indication of the veritable original would then belong to the class of impossibilities.

§ 10. EXAMINATION IN DETAIL OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE DIVISIBILITY OF THE PENTATEUCH INTO SEPARATE DOCUMENTS.

(A) GENESIS.

Turning away from the entirely arbitrary attempts at minute separation made by Ilgen on ch. i., we find, on the other hand, the view widely spread, that ch. i.—ii. 3, forms a distinct narrative of the Creation, which is to be definitely separated from the following piece, ch. ii. 4—iii.

If we pay attention, in the first place, to ii. 4, which verse is made to form the superscription of a new piece, the impropriety of this view soon appears. In ii. 1 we have a form of conclusion for

1 As is strikingly evinced by Vatke's proceeding, who imagines an upper-Asiatic origin, in which certainly the rage for hypothesis has indulged its capricious play without restraint.

2 Concerning its correct derivation from היה, see Ewald, Gr. p. 216. Hitzig on Isaiah, p. 4.

3 See Baur, Symbolik, i. p. 287.

the six days' work of creation: the important and particularly prominent account of the seventh day is attached to it in addition, and here we miss a similar form of conclusion. Why should not ii. 4 be that form? No certain conclusion can be drawn from אלה תולדות, for that may equally well be a form of commencement (see v. 1, vi. 9, x. 1), or a form of conclusion (x. 5, 20, 31, 32, xxxvi. 29, 43.) The contents of the verse then must decide. Now a "creation of the heavens and of the earth" is not spoken of in what follows, but only in what precedes. In order then to join the passage with what follows, it would require the arbitrary supposition that this has here been left out;[1] and setting aside every preconceived opinion, why should not this part that is left out be just the part that precedes? The view we oppose would deserve regard, only in case the preceding and subsequent portions stood in *contradiction* to one another.

We find the same use of words in the verse as in the preceding context, ברא and עשה having here the same relation to one another, as they have throughout in ch. i., comp. ii. 3, where עשה constantly signifies the accomplishment of the divine will;[2] so that on that account those writers are in error, who would begin a new sentence with ביום, and connect it with what follows; which also produces in fact a strange sense, since it is necessarily understood that at that time no plants, &c., were as yet in existence. Stress is laid, however, on "*Jehovah Elohim*," which now becomes the writer's standing expression, as being a diversity of verbal usage. But light is at once thrown on the use of *Jehovah*, by remarking that what is here spoken of is the completion of the work of creation on the seventh day, the Sabbath. For it is impossible not to recognise the reference to the theocratic legislation in that sketch, ii. 2, 3; and thus the theocratic king Jehovah is quite in his proper place here.

We must, however, admit that this leaves still unexplained the remarkable use of the title *Jehovah Elohim*. The expression is the more remarkable, as in historical writing it is exceedingly rare; and it is found there only in addresses to Jehovah, in the mouth of

1 Comp. Gabler, in Eichhorn's Urgesch. ii. 1, p. 18, ff., elsewhere p. 588, ff.

2 Comp. very good remarks concerning the relation of ברא, יצר, and עשה in Reimarus, de differ. Vv. Hebr. Rosenm., Comment. theol. iv. p. 294.

the speaker,[1] emotion in general leading to a multiplication of the names of God. But it soon becomes clear that the singularity of this use in a purely historical style is by no means explained by the supposition of another document, for this does not answer the question, but only puts it out of the way farther back. We are certainly justified in again putting the question, how any one came to employ this uncommon name. The remark that *Jehovah* designates the Supreme Deity, and *Elohim* the inferior subordinate gods,[2] however often it may be made, explains nothing. It does not explain the conjunction of the two; for such a fusion of Monotheism and Polytheism is in itself incomprehensible; and how could that idea be expressed at all in this manner, when אלהים is manifestly the predicate to יהוה and not the genitive, as is everywhere else indeed the case with this combination; or how could a narrator thus express himself, with the intention of giving his readers the idea that Jehovah works by his Elohim? Nor does it explain the use of the terms, since it still remains a strange thing that Jehovah is not represented sooner, in ch. i., as the higher all-governing Deity in the background, and Elohim as his mediating principle. We gain as little by the view, that the author here meant to say that the God, who is the Creator of the universe, is no other than Jehovah, the tutelary and national God of the Hebrews;[3] for, though this observation is far from being exactly false, it is still unsatisfactory, since we must still put the question why God is not so named in ch. i. as well, and for what reason this section contains so frequent a use of the form? Hence it follows that the reason must be sought in the peculiar character of the narrative—in its contents. As the creation, taken in its visible appearance, is a revelation of God in general, a reflection of his majesty and glory; this relation became altered after the fall, and the curse, pronounced by God on man and the earth. The revelation of God is now one that is to train man, viewed in reference to his sinful condition. This special guidance and training is connected with a particular race (זרע) and confined to it. With the fall is given the commencement of the development of the Theocracy,

1 Comp. Ewald, Compos. of Gen. p. 93.

2 See Gabler, l. c. p. 4, ff. Ewald, l. c. p. 95. Schumann, p. 81. Von Bohlen, p. 22, ff.

3 Comp. e. g. Rosenmüller, scholl. p. 93. Schott, opusc. ii. p. 60. Ranke p. 163.

since God here shews himself to be one who will not abandon fallen man in his helplessness and misery. Therefore God reveals himself specially as *Jehovah*. By the help of Jehovah, Eve bears a son (iv. 1); Jehovah speaks with Cain, and drives him out from his presence; the name of Jehovah is invoked by the pious race of the Sethites (iv. 26). Thus chapters ii. and iii. manifestly form the transition from ch. i. to ch. iv. How then could that part which is intermediate between the two conditions of man, be more appropriately marked than by the conjunction of the two names of God? Elohim the creator, and Jehovah the protector, deliverer, and redeemer, are not two different Gods—they are one and the same; but the mode of his manifestation was and must be different, according to the altered condition of man. Thus the condition of man in Paradise, with all that belongs to it, will be seen to stand quite apart from all the preceding and the subsequent history, if we keep in our eye the religious point of view assumed by Genesis,—that regard to the relation of man to God which every where prevails in it. Subsequently, the expression may certainly be used, formed by a purely theocratic view, that "*Jehovah hath cursed the ground*" (ver. 29), that *He is the Creator* (Exod. xx. 11), &c. But here, because of the previous narrative, the position assumed [der Standpunkt] was necessarily quite different. The whole life of man stood in the most intimate relation to the creative God (hence also *Elohim* alone is used in ch. iii. 1, 3, 5); but this God begins even here to prove himself Jehovah, and to provide for the salvation of his chosen race; see particularly iii. 15, where the separation of the seed of the woman from the seed of the serpent, is the fundamental thought that receives its further development in Genesis. But where all is so closely connected as in this narrative, the author could not suitably employ Elohim at one time, and Jehovah at another. The want of analogy which marks the contents of this portion of the narrative, as compared with all the rest, justifies him in using this peculiar name of God, and thus he accomplishes his end admirably, of connecting it with what goes before and what comes after. This circumstance is particularly important, in reference to ver. 4. While this verse, on the one hand, stands in the closest connection with the preceding context, it is plainly joined to the following also by means of the "Jehovah Elohim," yet in such a way as to mark the transition.

Let us now see whether we can find in the following context contradictions of the preceding. It has been remarked[1] that in ch. ii. 5, ff., there reigns a certain want of plan, with a confused and unconnected style of narration. If we investigate the point more closely, the observation will certainly appear unfounded, for it does not apply to ch. iii., which yet necessarily has the same author; but, in reference to ch. ii., it contains a measure of truth. That chapter is unintelligible without taking in what goes before. The narrative is there laid out in groups; but these separate paragraphs refer partly to the preceding context, partly stand in a certain connection with one another, partly form a preparatory introduction to ch. iii.

It was requisite, in the first place, to state *how* man was formed, so that the earthly nature of the Lord of creation might be known, and the fall, and the curse connected with that fact, be understood (ii. 5—7, comp. i. 28, iii. 19). The vegetable kingdom had not yet bloomed forth in its complete beauty, when man was formed;[2] but it was prepared by the mist that watered the ground. It is not the creation of the vegetable world that is spoken of, for that would require to be expressed in ver. 6; but the springing up of the plants. In ch. i. 12 the earth produces them (ותוצא), here their perfect formation is mentioned;[3] the latter, therefore, necessarily presupposes the former, just as ויצר, ver. 7, reminds us that the author does not intend to state the fact of formation, but only the manner of it. But the reason why the vegetable world is mentioned, is to show *in what circumstances* the first man found himself placed. It was in a garden full of beautiful trees, and these trees have at the same time a reference to the fall (ver. 8, 9). The author has spoken of the garden *in Eden*, and he does not omit to give a more exact definition of the country, so as to be able at the same time to describe its magnificence (ver. 10—15). But the question occurs, *what capacity* does Adam hold in that country? Unquestionably that of its lord (ver. 15, comp. i. 28), but limited at the same time by the divine command, which again explains to us his

[1] See Eichhorn, Urgesch. ii. 2, p. 32.

[2] [Ver. 5 of ch. ii. must not be rendered as in our C.V., but: "Now no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up," &c.; and thus stands quite independent of ver. 4, referring rather to ver. 7.—See Rosenm. scholl. in loc.—Tr.]

[3] Hence both expressions צימח and יצמח are used. Comp. in reference to the former the Syriac cognate, Castelli Lex. Syr., p. 898, Mich.

fall (ver. 16, 17.) Adam also dwells not here *alone;* it had only been said that they were created male and female (i. 27); but their relative position to one another, which again is so important for ch. iii., had not been mentioned. This cannot be stated by the author without representing the relation in which Adam stood to the rest of the animal world, and the relation, essentially different from the former, in which he stood to his wife. Here also it was not the formation of the woman in itself that came under consideration, but the mode of it, for in that consisted the difference established by God. Therefore, in ויצר, in ver. 19, the author again begins concerning the animal world. They were formed out of the ground, which again is in agreement with i. 24; only here, in accordance with the author's object, the manner of their origin is more exactly defined; not, however, in such a way that the retrogression should be marked by proper formulæ.[1] It is simply implied in the matter itself. The word יצר makes it plain enough that the previous fact and the further carrying out of it are here treated of. After this repetition of the account of the irrational creation, the creation of Adam should properly follow, but this has already been spoken of, so that the author can now immediately introduce the mode of the woman's creation. For to show that she is one with the man, and most intimately connected with him, is to him the main point of the narrative; with which is then joined, in ver. 25, as the transition to ch. iii., the short but expressive description of their mutual situation.

As ch. iv. is closely connected by its general contents and special reference (iv. 7, comp. iii. 16) with what precedes, it is on that account important to observe that in ver. 25 *Elohim*, and in ver. 26 *Jehovah*, is used. Nothing is left for the defenders of the documentary origin in this case but, after Astruc's example, to affirm that ver. 25 is interpolated, or to alter the reading. The reverse is the case in ch. v. 29, where *Jehovah* occurs instead of the other name of God elsewhere employed, and nothing but the same violent criticism can smooth the difficulty. This, however, is unadvisable, the more so as it is evident that the author uses the one name or the other with a perfect knowledge of what he is doing; *e. g.* in the account of Abel's sacrifice and Cain's, in the invocation or wor-

[1] The narration continues always to make historical progress; hence ויצר must on no account be taken, ungrammatically, as the pluperfect.

ship of the divine name, in the curse pronounced on the earth, and the deliverance through Noah, we have constantly the name *Jehovah*. Ch. v., accordingly, is anything but an isolated fragment. In ver. 1 and 2, there is a reference to i. 27, 28; ver. 3 refers to ch. iii., the fall of man, to which there is here only a brief and emphatic allusion in the words, "he begat in his own likeness," which thus presuppose the more detailed narration; and ver. 6 connects again with iv. 25, 26. Then we have in ver. 29 a still clearer reference to iii. 17. And the close of the genealogy, as it extends to Noah, connects the chapter with what follows.

By וידהי, ch. vi. is closely joined with the preceding. It is the moral condition of Noah's time that the author means to describe. The document-hypothesis is here obliged at once to take out ver. 3, but, not knowing what place to assign it, joins it in the most arbitrary manner with iv. 26,[1] which certainly does not suit. The less weight should be laid on the expression בני אלהים, since the entire Hebrew idiom left the author no choice of another expression. In short, if it is granted that vi. 3 stands in its proper place, we then have here again precisely the same regular change of the name. Jehovah will withdraw his Spirit from man; for his own specially beloved race, that of the Sethites, has not kept itself pure from sinful commixture. Then, in accordance with this declaration, Jehovah also forms the resolution utterly to destroy the human race (ver. 5—7).

Only Noah found favour with God, vi. 8. For the important statement that this patriarch would occupy a position of such consequence in the history, we were prepared by the significant prediction v. 29. His person is so important in the author's view that he must name his family once again, his three sons, though mentioned already (v. 32); for they also are of the greatest consequence in the history of the flood. He therefore begins with an אלה תולדות, which must not be taken for the superscription of a new section, but is only intended to draw the attention to this particularly remarkable family. But hardly has the author introduced the name of Noah, when he must at the same time state the reason why he found favour with God, and describe his godly life, in doing which he adds, not without meaning, בדרותיו, for the contrast between him and the accursed race is strikingly present to his view;

[1] Eichhorn, Einl. 3, p. 125.

hence once more, for the sake of the contrast, he must depict their depravity (vi. 11, 12). It was, in particular, this and other repetitions that disposed the critics to their dismemberment of the history of the flood. But how admirably is this first one explained at once by the author's purpose to bring before us a complete picture of the marked opposition referred to! How well is האלהים joined closely by the article to what precedes, so that the author by no means forgets his use of Jehovah (ver. 9, 11, comp. ver. 8)! How manifest is the advance in the heightened description of the guilty earth, from evil imaginations (vi. 5) to downright deeds of violence and outbreaks of sin (vi. 11, 12)! How could the universal spread of this corruption be better marked than in this impressive manner!

Two discourses of God follow; vi. 13, ff., and vii. 1—4. These, it seems, must not only be, the one the repetition of the other; the one distinguished by the name *Elohim*, the other by that of *Jehovah;* but they must also be in contradiction to one another. Now the one discourse is before the building of the ark, the other subsequent to it. In the latter, therefore, the building is supposed as completed: "go into *the* ark," (התבה) it is said, vii. 1. Can we imagine that a writer who so plainly connects his statement with what immediately precedes, would be guilty of falling into a contradiction? It is manifest that Jehovah is only defining with more exactness, considering the nature of the animals according to their cleanness, the number of those that were to be taken in; a command which now, at their actual entrance into the ark, first became of importance. As might be expected, it is *Jehovah* that speaks here; for the position assumed is entirely theocratic. The reference to the later Levitical laws is here too plainly prominent to permit at all that name of God to be wanting in this place. On the other hand the reference to the earlier appointment is not omitted, for the animals came to Noah *in pairs* (vii. 9). Here also *Jehovah* is exchanged for *Elohim* (vii. 9), as soon as the reference to the theocratic appointment retires into the back-ground.

We have already directed attention to the fact, that the author, occupied with the exalted nature of his subject, loves to present the most important points of it in many favourite turns of expression, dwelling upon them with pleasure. This mode of writing is particularly observable in the description he gives of the constantly in-

creasing mass of waters of the flood, laying all waste before them, vii. 13, ff. Here also he cannot often enough bring forward the wonderful and safe deliverance of the Noachides in opposition to the destruction of the human race. In this he only continues the contrast which he had previously marked. It was stated before that Noah had gone into the ark (vii. 7); but the narrator wishes farther to show the astonishing care that Jehovah took of those that were thus concealed, and how he kept them secure from all injury. The words, "Jehovah shut him in," vii. 16, are too important,[1] as contrasting with the fate of those who are surrendered by Jehovah to destruction, for the author to deny himself a second description of the act of entrance. The earlier account, which was a good deal interrupted by chronological statements, was for the purpose of pointing out the faithfulness of Noah in fulfilling the divine commands. Here the object changes, and the repetition accordingly is quite in its place. The description of the flood, accordingly, commences in the way of marked contrast, with all possible expressions that can paint the rising of the water; but to this part necessarily belongs, because of that contrast, the mention of the preserved family (vii. 23), and then the writer again begins concerning the waters (vii. 24). The same change, therefore, of the name of God, as in the previous sections, is here very significant; and it is with the greatest difficulty we can get rid of it, and only by again having recourse to a supposed interpolation.

Ch. viii. 1—19 describes Noah's deliverance in its completion, the exit from the ark; here also we remark quite the same style delighting in heightened repetitions (viii. 11, ff.); but no one would propose a separation here. There is, however, the more readiness to consider, viii. 20—22, and ix. 1—17, the sacrifice of Noah, and his covenant with God, as two documents that run parallel to each other, and which are again to be distinguished by the use of the divine names. It certainly appears at first sight, as if ix. 1, ff., might be joined immediately with viii. 19; but on closer conside-

1 Short as this sentence may appear, so much the more weight belongs to the thing itself, and to the name יהוה, which here is so significant, rendering all farther detail needless, since of itself it expresses the utmost that divine love could do for Noah. Where this immediate interference of God is less prominent, and where the narrative gives a more detailed description of the movements of divine providence, as in viii. 1, ff., the author at once suitably resumes the use of אלהים.

ration viii. 20—22 appears by no means so unconnected and separable. For the expression, "Jehovah determined with himself" (ויאמר אל לבו, ver. 21), by no means signifies a *promise* of God, imparted by him to Noah; but we rather look for such a promise to follow it. That *Jehovah*, however, should be named in this passage, is necessary because of the description of the sacrifice. On the other hand *Elohim* now begins ix. 1 to pronounce a blessing. And with propriety. It is only to Jehovah that Noah can sacrifice, and only Jehovah can graciously accept the offering; but the blessing is one that extends to Noah and his sons, and the remark is even now (ver. 19) made by the writer that they are to be the patriarchs of the whole new race of mankind, in which he makes a reference that is entirely preparatory to the selection[1] of one family. Here begins now a new creation as it were; and as the earth, coming forth from the waters, has renewed its youth, no other blessing but that which is appropriate to creation can here be repeated. The covenant, the blessing, the promise of God, the sign of the covenant itself, are quite of a universal character, which appears most plainly, where the author makes known through Noah the special curse and blessing pronounced on his sons. Here the God of Shem is expressly called *Jehovah;* the more, since, instead of Ham, Canaan is cursed (ver. 25, 26); Japhet shall be enlarged by *Elohim*. An historian cannot express more clearly than this, how strongly he wishes to distinguish in this respect the point of view which he assumes in the composition of his narrative. The two accounts of Noah's sacrifice and God's blessing bear exactly the same relation to one another, only in a larger extent, as the blessings of Shem and Japhet. We are in no wise justified in arbitrarily rending asunder the larger section any more than the smaller.

If we have observed how the dispersion of Noah's sons over the whole earth has been already made prominent, we shall not be surprised to find the same fact more exactly stated in ch. x.; certainly for the most part in mere names, for they have no more interest for our history, which is concerned only about the position of the Shemites in relation to the rest of the nations. The dis-

1 [*Ausscheidung:* lit. Separation; and the meaning here may be *Exclusion*, and the "one family" may intend that of the Canaanites (see last clause of ver. 18). The clause in the original is both obscure and ambiguous.—Tr.]

covery, however, is said to be made that ch. x. is an independent piece, having its parallel in xi. 10—26. The two pieces unquestionably are of a different character and bearing, the one cosmographical, the other genealogical; in the former we have a general indication of the relative descent of the different nations, in the other a special preparation for the history of Abraham by the statement of his pedigree. The latter again rests so much for support on that general basis, that it must necessarily be preceded by it, as is expressed by the narrator himself in the words אחר המבול, xi. 10. As everywhere in Genesis, so here also the author takes notice of the collateral lines, so as to set them forth clearly in their relation to the main line, which he treats in fuller historical detail, and to distinguish them from it. At the same time the genealogy in ch. xi. must serve a chronological purpose, which was quite wanting in ch. x. The author proceeds here also, as he did in ch. v., in his statements concerning the age of the father at the birth of his first son. Such statements could be given only as to the main-line. But ch. xi. 1—9, since it accounts for ch. x., pointing out the way in which the nations were separated and dispersed, must necessarily precede xi. 10; and is therefore connected not merely with what goes before, but also with what follows, as that supplies the statement of the unity of the race that was faithful to Jehovah, amidst all the division of the nations.

It has been proposed to look on xi. 27—32 also, as an independent, isolated piece, though Eichhorn (p. 115) dared pass no decision upon it: this too is purely impossible. As soon as the genealogy comes to Terah (xi. 25), it diverges, for in ver. 26 it names three sons of his, not one only. By that the author shows at once, as previously in the case of Noah, that he means to speak of this family at greater length, and to bring us into closer acquaintance with its circle. Therefore he gives more exactly the תולדות of Terah, in ver. 27, for Lot also belongs to the subsequent history. Thus it is no superfluous repetition. The contradictions between this piece and what follows are hardly worth regarding; Von Bohlen even has affirmed that the most important, viz., betwêen xii. 4 and xi. 32, cannot be made out.[2]

The nearer that the narrative draws to that which is its great

1 See this stated in more detail by Ranke, l. c., p. 181—192.

2 P. 157. Comp. particularly Ranke, p. 192, ff.

object, and the more splendidly in this respect that a new epoch for the covenant-people begins with Abraham, the more prominently also does *Jehovah* now appear in his glorious manifestation. In the events of Abraham's history, his departure from his home, and his life in Canaan and in Egypt, Jehovah everywhere reveals himself as the God who is present with him. The close connection of ch. xii. and ch. xiii. has not been overlooked. Yet it has been attempted to tear ch. xiv. out of its connection, and to declare it to be Elohistic, though the name of Jehovah is by no means wanting in it, ver. 19—22. But certainly there also occur in it designations of God that are quite peculiar. These, however, arise so out of the given historical causes, that care and intention are everywhere obvious (see farther on). The connection of xiv. 1 certainly seems to be loose, but the difficulty here is purely of an historical nature, and it is only in that respect that we have to remonstrate with our author, while it is just here that exact chronological statement is of no consequence to him, as is plain from the indefinite expression in xv. 1, אחר הדברים האלה. As little will it do to separate ch. xvii. and ch. xx., by insisting partly on the names of God, partly on the similarity to previous events presented by the occurrences. The first assertion is incorrect, since *Jehovah* is found in both chapters; see xvii. 1, xx. 18, comp. also xix. 29. The reason of the change of name is also quite clear from the context. The one time, it occurs in the vision of Abraham, (where it is only a divine revelation in general that is spoken of, in which the Deity testifies that he will be Abraham's God); the other time, in the history of Abraham when at the court of a heathen king, we find אלהים quite in its place; but both times the author does not omit to testify that this Deity is no other than Jehovah himself, the one time at the beginning, the other at the close of the statement. The second assertion is quite inapplicable. How could it anyhow lead us to the supposition of fragments or different documents? It affects simply the historical character of the narrator; it supposes him destitute of the qualifications of an historian, treating of the same fact in different forms, which forms have come into his hands in a detached condition. This is manifestly a supposition which cannot be properly examined till afterwards, on which consequently a new hypothesis must not be founded.

How wretched is the failure of the document-hypothesis in ch.

xxi. ! In ver. 1 and 33 we read *Jehovah*, who shows himself gracious to Sarah, and whose name Abraham invokes; on the other hand, in the episode of Hagar, and the transactions with Abimelech, the name *Elohim* is quite in its place. But here the context shows as clearly as possible, that no separation must be attempted. Thus Jehovah is here everywhere the central point, to which the history always comes back, in all its digressions never leaving him out of view, and thus making true historical progress. This becomes quite plain in ch. xxii. where the expression יהוה יראה is as it were the centre of the whole, to which the narrator, setting out from a more general point of view, gradually leads us.[1] But, farther on, it will be made particularly evident how in ch. xxiv., the difference of the two names is exactly regarded and expressly stated, so that one is obliged to admit that a single chapter of that kind destroys the hypothesis from its foundation. But above all ch. xxv. shows how well the author brings the life of Abraham to a close, and rounds it off as a whole, and with what nicety the transition is made to the life of Isaac. The previous history is here brought before us as in a recapitulation. Abraham takes another wife, and by this the history is closely connected with ch. xxiv., where information is given of the death of Sarah. He dismisses, however, all his sons, and separates them from Isaac, in which there is a plain reference to the history of Hagar. Abraham dies and is buried in his hereditary sepulchre, comp. ch. xxiii. The blessing of God then passes to Isaac. According to custom, the related line of Ishmael is also genealogically explained (comp. xvii. 20); and the author then passes on to Isaac himself, and introduces the commencement of this new history with a genealogical glance of retrospect to what had happened already in Abraham's life-time (xxv. 19, ff., comp. ch. xxiv.). It is thus a mere impossibility to divide the piece, as has so unsuccessfully been attempted. A similar relative connection is found in chs. xxvi., xxvii., xxviii., where a constant reference to the earlier part prevails (see the passages in Schumann pp. 386, 396); indeed, the farther we advance in the narrative, the more is the following portion a continuation of that which precedes.

The document-hypothesis separates ch. xxvii. 1—45 from xxvii. 46—xxviii. 9, as two parallel accounts of the occasion of Jacob's

[1] Comp. on Hitzig's attacks on this chap. Ranke, p. 211, ff.

journey. But a single verse destroys the hypothesis; in xxviii. 7 it is said, "And Jacob obeyed his father and his mother, and went to Mesopotamia." So then that command proceeds as much from Rebecca (xxvii. 43) as from Isaac, and the two so-called original documents cannot run parallel, since they refer to one another. Again it is said that in ch. xxx. 23 two different etymologies of the name *Joseph* are given, and therefore ch. xxx. 1—23 must form another separate document. Now here it is just the beauty of the expression in the two verses that is completely missed: joy on account of the son received (אָסַף), and a longing for more progeny (יֹסֵף) ,are intermingled in the heart of Rachel, and the same verb is employed as most fitly uniting both ideas, thus also binding the verses together most closely. With ch. xxxi. a still more arbitrary procedure is adopted. The hypothesis here tears ver. 3 out of the connection; but in order to account for the thought, it must also separate ver. 1, and with equal violence declare ver. 49 to be interpolated.

Attempts have been made on ch. xxxv. to separate it both into documents and into fragments. It is evident, that by the arrival of Jacob at Shechem (xxxiii. 18), the scene of occurrences is supplied, and by that not only ch. xxxiv., but also ch. xxxv. are brought into close conjunction. It is true, that here the name of Jacob is once more appointed by God to be *Israel* (comp. xxxii. 22, ff.), but this is manifestly the simple confirmation of the name already given, standing in the same relation as the fresh announcement of the significant name *Bethel*. For we see that this writer knows very well, what information he has already given about that place (xxxv. 3, 6, 7), and yet he does not hesitate to say, "he called the place Bethel (properly El-Bethel)." Can a narrator tell us more plainly than in this way, that he is *fully aware* of the repetitions, that he has by no means blindly huddled together documents and fragments, but that he regards facts of that kind as having really occurred more than once? We may then quarrel with this history for being such a history, but we cannot possibly assail the identity of its narrator. The author concludes xxxv. 23, ff. with the genealogy of the sons of Jacob. But this is evidently done with a two-fold intention: in the first place, to recapitulate what goes before, and to direct the reader's attention to the fact, that the twelve patriarchs of Israel were now in existence, and on

that account expressly we are reminded by the writer of Mesopotamia, and the memorable occurrences there (xxxv. 26); they are so vividly present to him, that he takes no farther notice of the circumstance that Benjamin was not born there, plainly supposing that this will be known from what precedes. At the death and burial of Isaac, which are then mentioned, Esau and Jacob are present; and we are thus led both by the genealogy and by the history to the genealogy of the collateral line of Esau (ch. xxxvi.) This is the second intention, to introduce what follows. It is about the last time that we find the brothers together; their families now part asunder into two distinct nations, standing at a later period in mutual hostile opposition. However peculiar the genealogy in ch. xxxvi. may be, its character is completely explained by what precedes, the object being to show the increase of this family to a great and mighty people. How then can it be thought that this document was formerly an independent one, much less a mutilated fragment? What then could occasion the peculiar plan of it?[1] The very intimation that Esau's wives were women of Canaan, should have suggested the observation, that the preceding part, where mention is made of this circumstance, is supposed to be known. Instead of that, from a partial diversity of names, the conclusion is drawn of a diversity of documents, in place of taking the trouble to give an historical explanation of the difference, which is the only explanation that can be given. Instead of recognising in xxxvi. 6 an agreement with xxxii. 3, 4, as to the abode of Esau in Seir, the conclusion is drawn of a chronological contradiction, although the information could not possibly be furnished by the genealogy in any other way, the proper nature of which consequently ought first to have been examined.[2]

The history of Joseph also is affirmed by recent criticism to be a composition made up from sources that are quite diverse.[3] The passages in ch. xxxvii. that apparently betray confusion are no proof at all of want of connection; they affect merely the character of the narration, so that we might designate it as defective or inexact, in which case, indeed, the demands which we make in general on ancient historiography, would require to be of a very

1 See on this, Ewald, comp. d. Gen. p. 251, ff.

2 Comp. Ranke, l. c. p. 243, ff.

3 See *e. g.* De Wette, Einl. pp. 194, 195.

peculiar kind.[1] The place assigned to ch. xxxviii. is quite appropriate, as being the history of the sons of Jacob, who remain in Canaan, in opposition to that of Joseph, who was led into Egypt: hence also the chronological plan is here adhered to only in a general way (xxxviii. 1). In this arrangement we see a writer, who does not arrange his history so as to follow only a mere external principle, such as a purely chronological method, but is fully concerned for its æsthetic representation and its higher aspects, and displays in this the art of a master.[2] The difficulties that have been found in ch. xxxix. and xl., are insignificant, arising from not understanding the fact that Potiphar, as captain of the body-guard, was at the same time the chief overseer of the prison; or from adducing it as a contradiction between ch. xlviii. and ch. xlix. that in the former place thirteen tribes must be spoken of, while in the latter only twelve are named, although everywhere in the Hebrew records mention is made of only twelve tribes (Ranke, p. 275). We shall come afterwards, however, to consider what are brought forward as historical inaccuracies in this document. We shall here only add the remark that those pieces which De Wette specifies as being "without doubt" Elohistic, are by no means convincing. Thus in the very first piece, xlvi. 1—7, the name *Elohim* appears to be only appropriate, since it is a vision that is spoken of, in which the divine appearance informs Jacob that he is the God of his fathers; where the document itself consequently points to the name *Jehovah*, which, however, from the nature of the case, is not mentioned. As little can the supposition be maintained in ch. xlviii., since here also Jacob constantly speaks of a certain definite God (האלהים), who can be no other than Jehovah. In ch. xlix., however, ver. 18 must be assumed to be another interpolation, in order to support the hypothesis.

§ 11. THE RESULT WITH REGARD TO THE SOURCES OF GENESIS.

According to what has been remarked above, the criteria that have been hitherto proposed for the separation of the supposed originals of the work do not stand a closer examination. The de-

[1] Comp, Schumann, p. 536. Von Bohlen, p. 353. Ranke, p. 258, ff.

[2] See the admirable exhibition of this in Ranke, p. 262.

viation of each originator or defender of this hypothesis from the others shows the purely subjective character which the investigation has assumed in their hands. Ewald gave a very excellent exhibition of the untenableness of this thoroughly empiric procedure, by showing how it might be applied to another Old Testament book, that of Judges, and thus at the same time pointed out its uncritical character by striking evidence. All these hypotheses fail us just where they lay claim to the greatest probability, while in the other parts of Genesis it is quite impossible to carry them out at all.

These investigations, as hitherto conducted, have deserved the general reproach of not setting out from the only position that could lead to more accurate results, namely, the recognition of the unity of the plan, and the harmonious conjunction of the individual parts of the work, but constantly directing research only to the discovery of unconnectedness and isolated parts. But if that undeniable fact were placed at the outset of the inquiry, as it certainly ought, we then at once recognise in the book a mode of historical composition, which by no means proceeds in the way of awkward compilation, or strings fragments together inconsiderately without proper connection, but everywhere follows a definite order and regularity in drawing out the thread of the history. But where there is no compilation, there may still be a working up of previous materials, supposing that these really exist and are not an arbitrary fiction. The question consequently arises, how can we with most certainty explain the working up in Genesis of the historical matter that previously existed? If an historical subject had already received a fixed and definite form, given to it by written documents, it would certainly be difficult, from the character of oriental historical composition, to explain how it should come to be worked up into another peculiar and entirely independent form; though the conception might be admitted, that the influence of theocratic views produced this independent character in Hebrew historiography. But the question recurs, cannot a more natural explanation be furnished of that adherence to plan and harmony of parts, which we meet with in Genesis, in some other way than by the supposition of certain written documents, which must set limits to that organic form, and necessarily impress a unity upon it. No kind of intimation is anywhere supplied concerning a written record belonging to that period, and yet, com-

pared with the other historical books, there was no want of opportunities for such allusions. *E. g.* in the case of the songs that are interwoven in the narrative, as in ch. iv. 23, 24, ch. xlix., and the transactions of ch. xxiii. (comp. on the other hand the passages of the Pentateuch quoted in § 4), &c. To this must be added, that Genesis itself appears to allude to what must appear probable in itself, considering the subject and the time, namely, to an old *traditional* mode of information, which the author presupposes as existing in that age. We have a special instance of this in xviii. 19, where the delivery of the promises to Abraham is not regarded as an advantage belonging to himself only as an individual, but as an inheritance to be made over by him to his house and his posterity. The passage xxii. 20 deserves not less attention, where the author means to communicate information concerning the family of Nahor, but introduces this communication with no sort of appeal to a written record, but with the remark that it was *told* Abraham, thus evidently referring to *traditional* knowledge preserved within the circle of the Abrahamic race. To a like kind of thing allusion is also sometimes made by the tone of the narrative: "Moses sometimes presupposes a thing as already known from ancient tales, *e. g. the giants*, those renowned heroes of the old world, vi. 4, and the fame of Nimrod, x. 8—12. He must therefore have been acquainted with more ancient accounts, which were certainly known to his readers." (Michaelis. Einl. i. p. 277). But other books also present an agreement in this respect. We read notices in 1 Chron. [iv. 21—23] relating to the tribe of Judah at the time of their abode in Egypt, and the author makes the remark upon them הדברים עתיקים, in opposition to the דברי הימים, referring however certainly to orally propagated tradition, the ספר, by which he is elsewhere guided, here failing him (Esth. vi. 1, 1 Chron. xxvii. 24). The notices also, which we find incidentally given in the later prophets, and which relate to the ancient Mosaic time, where the Pentateuch contains no special information (Amos v. 26, 27), belong perhaps to such a tradition. The statement also in Josh. xxiv. 2, 14, is evidence that in the period immediately subsequent to Moses, a very distinct knowledge was possessed of the patriarchal age; and it alludes to a tradition that endured to a still later time, as we may

naturally suppose that it would not undergo a sudden and total extinction.[1]

The question, how far this tradition may lay claim to historical truth and internal worth, cannot be satisfactorily answered till afterwards. We shall here meanwhile only make some remarks, that will serve clearly to show the suitableness of such a tradition to such an age. In that age we find not only a simplicity in the entire mode of life, and a duration of life, which must have facilitated in a high degree an oral transmission, but likewise the unity of one race which has a firm internal connection, and keeps itself uninterruptedly separate from foreign elements. Now what preserves this race in its internal union is nothing else than its history itself, which assigns it a wholly peculiar position, from which its existence receives both its origin and its conditions. Here tradition must have been maintained only in a unique and connected form, and the need of preserving it pure by writing must have been less felt, since there was no danger of its being mixed with other traditions. In this respect we should regard it as an important fact, that the tradition ceases to be preserved to us just when the life of the people, through the residence in Egypt, comes in the place of the family-life of the patriarchs. It is only the latter mode of life that forms the proper foundation of faithful and sure transmission. On the other hand, however, the subject also of this tradition must not be overlooked. This, in its whole nature, is of a religious character; it is a sacred revelation of God in a series of memorable occurrences, which by this their internal purport could not fail to exert as great an influence on those who received those manifestations, as they would produce a permanent impression on their posterity. Thus, then, with regard also to the subject of the tradition, we find unity prevailing, which conducted the individual step by step from a certain principle to fixed aims, who, as he found in the object thus presented to him, ever fresh animation and excitement, must, on the other hand, have felt himself as much constrained to leave that which had thus been committed to him as a sacred inheritance to his race.

1 In the old world, even long after authorship had been practised, living oral narration continued in general to be the chief means of the transmission of history. Comp. Deut. xxxii. 7; Joel i. 3; Ps. lxxviii. 2." Bleek, Stud. u. Krit. 1831, 3, p. 500.

If our narrative, then, according to many indications, has its origin primarily in oral tradition, the question still occurs, how another consideration can be reconciled with this, which seems to contain that portion of truth that must be allowed to lie at the bottom of the inquiries after original records? This respects a number of peculiarities that belong to our book, which, without belonging exactly to the peculiar nature of the subject treated in it, distinguish it from the rest of the Pentateuch. A particular usage of words prevails in it, containing a considerable number of expressions that are not only not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, but are even exchanged for others. *E.g.* frequently as mention is made in the Pentateuch of *possession, property*, and *heirship* yet nowhere do we find the expression belonging to these בן-משק, xv. 2; the military term הריק, xiv. 14, does not occur again; instead of נבנה, xvi. 2, xxx. 3, we have elsewhere בנה את ביתו, Deut. xxv. 9; instead of אמתחת, xlii. 28, et alib., elsewhere שק, Levit. xi. 32; instead of פדן ארם, so frequent in Gen., elsewhere ארם נהרים, Deut. xxiii. 5, comp. Num. xxii. 5; instead of תשוקה, iii. 16, iv. 7, elsewhere תאוה; זבל, xxx. 20, is never found again in the sense of *concumbere*, or the phrase peculiar to Gen. קרא בשם יהוה, iv. 26, xii. 8, et al. הנה לפניך הוא, xiii. 9, xx. 15, xxiv. 51, xxxiv. 10, xlvii. 6. Since these peculiarities, which besides are found in both the sources distinguished by the critics,[1] can hardly be laid to the account of the style in which the traditions were expressed, since they are of too great an extent for that,[2] and cannot either be properly explained from the endeavour to reproduce and represent in the style the antiquity of the period referred to, which rather gives rise to the occasionally rhetorical and elevated style, and a certain poetical colouring; this circumstance must with great probability lead us to the supposition that in the time of the writer a part of the oral tradition had already been committed to writing. From this also we obtain a good explanation of the custom that prevails in Genesis, of subjoining an interpretation to the older and less common expression;[3] which shows that the author makes use of certain older monuments with fidelity, but at the same time with freedom. This occurs not

[1] As Stähelin also, p. 89. observes on two certainly very remarkable phrases.

[2] Comp. the collection in Schumann, proll. p. xlvi. sq.

[3] Comp. Michaelis l. c. p. 274.

only with the names of places, with regard to which, indeed, it might possibly be the case that both names were still in use in the time of the author, but with other expressions also. Thus the author explains the very old word מבול by the addition of מים, Gen. vi. 17, ff. (comp. Ewald, Gr. § 518); the word חניכיו, xiv. 14, by ילידי ביתו; comp. also xv. 2 with xxiv. 2, where, as soon as the author himself speaks, the plainer phrase is given, which explains the more obscure expression previously occurring in the discourse of another; so in the history of Joseph he explains אמתחת by שק, and בית הסהר by בור, xl. 15.[1]

But these considerations are still very far from proving the possibility of a distinct separation of the original sources. This is at once prevented by the circumstance, that the author certainly holds to tradition as well as to written documents, so that he was thus quite raised above the need of any careful arrangement of those sources. But above all the peculiar plan of the author must be regarded. Genesis is so far from being a book concluded and complete in itself, that the proper understanding of it is to be obtained only by means of the following parts of the Pentateuch. It is they that must confer on the whole of the primitive history an entirely independent importance: in all its parts there must be brought out clearly and definitely the reference to the time of Moses, which must be displayed as an epoch that gives an entirely new constitution to Israel. This primitive theocratic feeling then, as we might call it, pervades the whole book, so that the fact of its unity ought now the less to be given up. Thus the enquiry into the sources of Genesis will receive the more satisfactory an answer, according as it is demonstrated that, whatever the author found of old traditions and histories, was combined by him into a higher whole, so that in its present form a higher spirit, an elevated idea and reference, pervade and animate it.

§ 12. CONTINUATION. (B) EXODUS.

The most important subject with which our historian has to deal at the commencement of this book is unquestionably the calling of

1 A similar method prevails among the Arabian authors, *e. g.* Abulf. hist. Anteisl. p. 116, 1. Fleisch.

Moses, and the solemn fact of the Deliverance; all else is only preparatory. Hence the information is here but brief and more in the way of allusion. (Ch. i. and ii.) But from ch. iii. onwards, fragments are said to be found. According to De Wette iii. 1—4, 18 runs parallel with vi. 2—8, which latter joins immediately with ch. i., ii. So in iv. 19—26 and iv. 27—31 a fragmentary style of composition must be recognized. Now let attention be paid in the first place to the chronological progress which is exactly observed in the facts: the call of Moses (iii. iv. 1—18), his departure, the occurrence by the way (iv. 19—26), the meeting with Aaron, and the interview with the children of Israel (iv. 27—31) —these unquestionably are occurrences that belong together. Along with this we have to consider, how at once from the first conversation of Jehovah with Moses we acquire a knowledge of the latter, as a man who timidly draws back from the mighty undertaking, and a knowledge of Jehovah as not ceasing patiently to bear with him, while he shames his pusillanimity and strengthens his faith. Hence also we shall not be surprised to see these traits repeated. Jehovah does not cease to strengthen him by new and more powerful exhortations, iv. 21, 22, which should give him a still firmer conviction that the work of liberation will prove as certain in its accomplishment, as it is one that proceeds only from Jehovah. Scarcely has Moses gone to Pharaoh, and the people become discouraged, when God's ambassador shrinks back again (v. 22, 23). But again Jehovah rouses and lifts him up, directing his attention as well to his promise of what he would do to Pharaoh, as above all to his covenant relation to Israel. Thus Moses knows what he has to say to his people, but from them again he obtains no hearing (vi. 12). It now appears as if Moses had an excuse; he can appeal to the example of the Israelites, and may well say that he is deficient in eloquence, so that his address would have still less success with Pharaoh. But the will of God remains unalterable; Moses and Aaron must go to Pharaoh (vi. 13). The brief way in which this last fact is related, just proves that the writer, after all the detail into which he had gone in those discourses of God with Moses, now expects of his readers that they will be able to understand this brief indication. And thus we can here recognise only a history that is carried out with exact psychological truth, but by no means separate fragments. As criticism has paid no regard to this psy-

chological point of view which here explains everything, it cannot fail to misunderstand the necessary repetitions which are founded on it, and which indeed in other respects are of particular interest. The history is here indeed somewhat singularly interrupted by a piece of genealogy, vi. 14—27, which to oriental historiographers, however, is as intelligible as it is full of meaning. It is a notice corresponding with that which we subsequently have concerning the age of the two brothers, vii. 7. The more important that these individuals now become in the history, the more does the author hold it to be his duty to make the reader acquainted with what relates to their persons. We should accompany such a notice with remarks, and thus perhaps introduce it more adroitly. Our author is satisfied with the simple, as it were parenthetic, introduction of it. How little he believes the context interrupted by it, is shown in vi. 28, ff., which joins on exactly by way of supplement with the narration vi. 13, that was broken off, the continuation of which is recognized only by the result and the general subject. The progress of the narrative, and the advance in the discourses of Jehovah, are here quite visible. The simple command to go to the king, is followed by the more emphatic direction: "I am Jehovah, speak unto Pharaoh," &c., where the power and significance of that name are supposed as already known. For the third time Jehovah declares the relation in which Aaron shall stand to Moses, whom he thus deprives of any further pretext for fresh excuses. God also adds the new assurance that the hardness of the king's heart should give occasion to the execution of divine punishments, that should furnish the most splendid proofs of Jehovah's majesty; so that all this contains throughout no contradiction of what goes before (De Wette, Beitr. p. 191).

The law of the Passover and what stands in connection with it, ch. xii., xiii., are affirmed to consist of very detached pieces. But we shall point out the internal connection of these laws afterwards. The supposition of a parallel "legislation at Marah" (xv. 22—26), and "at Sinai" (xix.)[1] is still more arbitrary; for who could well describe the former section as properly the giving of a law, when it manifestly contains only the preparation for such; the whole account of the event, which is the occasion of it, suggesting the object to be that the people should be convinced that Jehovah

1 See the review in De Wette, Einl. p. 196.

intended their good, and so become willing to receive and follow his law. In every respect ch. xviii. is important for the connection. Here ver. 3 refers back to ii. 22, and it ought not to be said that the introduction is of such a kind as if no previous statement had been made. For the name of the one son is repeated because of the other's being given in ver. 4; and in both the names of Moses' sons, his own history, and that of the people which was connected with it, were strikingly expressed. That Moses had sent Zipporah back again to her father, is not expressly said, iv. 20, although, after that, Moses alone comes before us. Here now in xviii. 2 the supplementary statement is given that he had sent her back, which has been regarded as a contradiction, instead of a reference to the earlier part being seen in it. But it ought the less to have been overlooked, that xviii. 1, 8 ff., has a retrospective regard to all the preceding history, since that chapter thus recognises it most distinctly as a connected whole. But that Num. xi. does not contradict this passage, is allowed by Vater himself (iii. p. 442); but the historical relation in which they stand to one another cannot be shown till afterwards.

That the portions which treat of the Tabernacle do not contain duplicate records or fragments, has been already made clear by § 6. Vater and De Wette will have it that xxxiii. 7—11 is an Elohistic account, which stands quite isolated and complete in itself. What sort of sense, then, can be given to the whole procedure of Moses there described? The context that immediately precedes, mentioning the idolatry of Israel, gives only a partial and very incomplete explanation. It is only the previous statement of the promise of God to dwell in a certain tent that explains it to us. The tent (האהל) has been named before; Moses now takes it and places it outside the polluted camp. In ch. xxxv. ff. also the existence of such a tent is supposed, and it is only the additional fabrication of what belonged to it that is spoken of. Thus the section in question forms precisely a suitable middle part to both narratives. It is right to call to mind also that in ch. xxxiv. 34, ff., a tent is supposed to be already in existence, and thus that chapter too serves only to confirm our view. The law of the Sabbath in xxxv. 1—3 is said to be quite a detached fragment. But it stands in close relation to what follows, inasmuch as the fundamental thought of the entire system of worship required again to be in-

culcated at the erection of the Tabernacle. Thus that law had already been communicated to Moses (xxxi. 12, ff.,) and it was his duty accordingly now to repeat the communication of it to the people. So that here also exact reference is had as well to what precedes as to what follows.

Vater admits that in Exodus there is more connection than in Genesis (p. 448): had he paid more regard to the entire grand structure of this book in its positive aspect, he would have recognised more than a "faint thread" of connection as extending through the whole of it.

§ 13. CONTINUATION. (C) LEVITICUS.

That this book has arisen out of separate treatises of diverse character, is said to appear,[1]

1. From the subscriptions vii. 37, ff., xi. 46, ff., xiv. 57, xv. 32, ff. On the other side, see § 8.

2. From the appendix in ch. xxvii., and the double subscription of the book in xxvi. 46, and xxvii. 34. For proof that ch. xxvii. is not out of connection with the foregoing, see § 6; but as relates to the subscriptions, it is certainly a law subsequently promulgated that is given in that chapter, which can by no means be regarded as "a separate and different kind" of composition. These subscriptions, which are employed with a certain regularity in the designation of the sections connected with them, have a general importance, inasmuch as they form external marks of the historical development of the giving and promulgation of the laws. No one can suppose that all these laws had their origin at once. The present passage then bears an intended reference to sections of that character; it supplies an historical remark, to the effect that these also were commands given at Sinai; and if we transport ourselves into the condition and circumstances of the time, we shall be convinced that a writer could express himself in no other way, if he wished to unite exactness of statement with equal simplicity of style.

3. An appeal is made to the independent completeness of many

[1] See De Wette, Einl. § 152. Comp. Vater, iii. p. 449, ff.

portions, especially ch. xix. and ch. xxiii. We need only compare the commencement of ch. xviii. with that of ch. xix., to discover the connecting fundamental thought, which extends also through ch. xx. Ch. xxiii., however, can still less be regarded as standing apart, if it is compared with the continuation concerning sacred seasons that follows, comp. § 6.

4. An objection is derived from the want of connection in such pieces as xxiv. 1—9, 10—23, xxvi. 1, 2. Certainly the first two pieces have no immediate reference to one another, the subject of the one being *law*, and that of the other *history;* but the law manifestly refers to the preceding chapter, and of the narrative no one can affirm, any more than of Ex. xxxii. ff., that it does not fit into the plan of the whole; its position, however, was assigned it in this place on chronological grounds. That xxvi. 1, 2, again expresses a general thought that is often repeated elsewhere, need surprise no one, considering the contents of the chapter.

5. The repetitions are adduced, which are supplied by comparison of the different portions of the book with one another, as well as with those of the preceding: comp. xvii. 15 with xi. 40, xix. 26 with xvii. 10, ff., iii. 17, vii. 26, xx. 27 with xix. 31, &c. This argument rests on the general incorrect view entertained of the way in which the Mosaic law originated. For we must not look upon it as a work composed according to a systematic arrangement of matters, and delivered to the people as a whole; this is plainly contradicted by the history of the legislation; on the contrary, the promulgation of it advanced with the history of the people, and arose progressively in a manner conformable to their internal condition. Thus repetitions are in themselves unavoidable, even as in the instructions of our Saviour we unquestionably meet with the same thought, expressed on several occasions and in different connections. This is especially true of certain fundamental thoughts, which the people required always to have in view as points of connection for the rest, and which hence called for a more frequent reiteration, *e. g.*, the law of the Sabbath, of the eating of blood, &c. Besides, the precision of the juridical style in these laws requires the same thought to be taken up again in the same form, where it appeared necessary to bring it again to remembrance. To this, finally, it should be added that these repetitions mutually supplement one another, so that the later statements stand in close relation to the

earlier. Thus *e. g.*, the direction concerning the shew-bread is given only briefly in Ex. xxv. 30, but more exactly, and so as to complete the earlier announcement, in Lev. xxiv. 5—9; so in xix. 31 a prohibition is given, and in xx. 27 the mode of punishment for those who transgress it; so xix. 9 and xxiii. 22, and similar instances, are negative and positive complements of each other.

6. Lastly, the diversity of style is appealed to. Here such suppositions as those of Vater are most arbitrary; that the law concerning the sin-offering and the trespass-offering differ simply in the expressions חטאת and אשם, chs. iv. and v. But it is no better for De Wette *e. g.* to adduce particularly the forms of introduction (xxv. 1, and i. 1, &c.) as being such diversities; for it is in the nature of the thing that manifold turns must prevail there.

De Wette himself, to a certain extent, gives up his own hypothesis by the following admission: "It seems as though the history of the transactions at Sinai should conclude with the second book (xl. 31, ff., 36—38), but many portions of law, referring to it, still remained, or there was much matter still to be treated at greater length, &c." (*ibid.* § 153). A glance at the passages adduced from Exodus shows that they present no trace of those transactions being closed. But when it appears, on De Wette's admission, that our book stands in such a relation to the preceding, then its author cannot possibly have composed it otherwise than according to a definite plan well known to himself. This plan, however, was no other than to write the remaining portion of the people's history, and that of the law delivered to them at Sinai. This idea at once conducts us, on the one hand, to the full perception of the untenableness of De Wette's arguments against the unity of the work, since they pay no regard whatever to that plan of the author's; and, on the other hand, to the opinion that the work has an internal connection, which can be discovered only by the method of genuine *historical* inquiry.

§ 14. CONTINUATION. (D). NUMBERS AND DEUTERONOMY.

It is maintained with great confidence that the book of Numbers is a collection of fragments; "no one" (says De Wette, § 154) "can deny the want of connection in its parts." With this,

however, his other assertions do not very well agree. In the same section it is said: "This book evidently has been collected, or at least brought into its present form, later than the book of Leviticus;—and if we compare the chronological data that occur in it, we shall not hesitate to assign it a relatively later composition." But for what precise reason was it collected and brought into this shape? The answer is: "what was forgotten in the former, was here to be supplied." A strange conclusion this. The book is closely connected with the preceding; consequently, in that something has been forgotten: is every continuation of the history then to be explained in this way?

We are referred to the sections, ch. i.—x., xv. 1—31, 32—36, 37—41, xix. 28—30, through all of which we have shown an evident thread of connection running (§ 6), which our opponents certainly have wanted inclination to trace, though such an investigation is the first hermeneutical requisite in the treatment of any work. We are referred to the chronological statement, i. 1, compared with ix. 1, which certainly do not agree; but if we look to ix. 11 and x. 11, we cannot fail to discover the exact chronological progress, and at the same time the reason why ix. 1, ff., has its place just there. But, it is said, in xxi. 14, ff., the collector has *betrayed* the mode of his procedure. Shall we say then that, where *one authority* is quoted, the whole of a work consists of fragments. The opposite conclusion would be more correct: if the author quotes his authorities exactly, then where he quotes none, he records facts as an eye-witness, and therefore we ought beforehand not to expect any confused account from him.

Much stress is laid on the instances in which this book is said to be at variance with itself and with the previous books. But this argument again is inconsistent with the supposed later composition of the book. Could our author have been so stupid and thoughtless as not to observe these differences? But this view has a meaning that leads us still further: it destroys at the same time the historical worth, the credibility of the book. We must therefore reserve its closer examination till afterwards.

"Deuteronomy also does not form a whole, proceeding from one effort, though it has more unity than the other books. Ch. i. 1—iv. 40, is separated not only by the insertion iv. 41—43, but especially by iv. 44—49, a superscription similar to ch. i. 1—4, but

yet varying both from it and from iii. 9, and introducing as a separate piece, by a fresh announcement, the discourse which extends to xxvi. 19." Thus De Wette, § 155. It is, however, conceded at once that the section is most strikingly related to what follows in thought and language. To what then should the attempt at separation lead us? To decide that what follows from ch. v. was spoken subsequently? That is surely affirmed plainly enough. The adduced insertion is an historical remark, and no superscription. Does it follow from this that the passages may be divided? Let it then be proved that the historical fact narrated here does not belong to this place, and the argument might then deserve some attention.

It is said, however, that the blessing of Moses cannot have proceeded from the same author. Whoever has obtained a just perception of the prophetical spirit that pervades the book, and the rhetorical element which thence prevails in it, will see, in ch. xxxii. xxxiii. only the heightened transition of the rhetorical into the poetical style, and will thus discover an admirable advance in the composition. But the proof should first be adduced that, from their internal nature, these chapters could not be the work of the same author. Concerning the assumed disagreements of this book with the others, see what follows.

§ 15.—INTERNAL TRUTH OF THE PENTATEUCH. CRITICISM OF THE HISTORY IN IT. THE PRIMITIVE HISTORY, GEN. I.—III.[1]

If the Pentateuch would fully maintain its right to the position which it claims, as the work of Moses and the commencement of the sacred records of the covenant-people, it must fulfil the requisition of showing itself to be a work *historically true*,—containing a history which shall vindicate itself by critical examination as maintaining invariably the character of perfect truth in reference to the assumed period of its composition. This demand must be answered by the account of the Pre-Mosaic period in the first place. This, however, is so connected, as part of an inseparable whole, with the history of

1 Comp. especially Lüderwald, die allegorische Erkl. d. 3 ersten capp. Mos.—in ihrem Ungrunde dargest. 1781. Cramer, Nebenarbeiten z. Theol. Liter. St. 2.—Werner, geschichtliche Auffassung der ersten capp. des ersten B. Moses. 1829.

the proper Mosaic period, forming indeed the very foundation of the Theocracy, that if it gives way, that which is built upon it shares a like fate. If then we find even in the primitive Hebrew history obscure, disfigured, and confused tradition prevailing; if, instead of an independent narrative, pursued in the true theocratic spirit, we have a mythology of external origin formed under a later foreign influence; and, instead of objective truth, poetry and philosophy, the later production of manifold causes; we are then driven from historical ground, and deprived of the possession of a genuine memorial of the Mosaic age. But if the primitive history of the Theocracy is in the most proper sense that which it professes to be, it must be shown in the first place to be original, and secondly, through its being so, to contain real occurrences: its truth then lies in its *historical originality*. This again is made out, partly by a close examination of the contents of the sacred record, partly by the external process of comparing with it that which assumes a place at its side as related or similar to it, and which must at the same time be shewn to be secondary and derived.

It could hardly be supposed that what we call the primitive history of the Hebrews could be designated precisely as "un-Mosaic;" for, even by those who had long been prepared to give up its purely historical character, it was still admitted to proceed indubitably from the founder of the Theocracy.[1] But this involved the internal inconsistency of not comprehending the necessary connection of what is "Mosaic" and what is "historical." Here then the consistency of critical scepticism could not fail to break through, and it came to this, that the first eleven chapters of Genesis were first accounted to be at least non-Mosaic in their origin, though still with a certain regard for their deep religious import, but to have been composed earlier than the other books of the Pentateuch;[2] and then were referred to the period of the Assyrian or even the Babylonian exile.[3] Let us here first examine this view in itself. In its full extent, as it contradicts the express testimonies of the later Hebrew books, it must receive its complete refutation in the subsequent sections.

1 Comp. Eichhorn, Einl. iii. p. 65, ff.

2 Comp. De Wette, Einl. § 158, b. and Vater l. c. p. 597, ff.

3 Comp. Hartmann, Aufklär. üb. As. i. p. 19, ff. (üb. d. Pent. p. 794, ff.) Pustkuchen, hist. crit. Unters. d. bibl. Urgesch. p. 10, ff.; Schumann on Genesis, p. lxix. sq.; Von Bohlen, Genesis, p. cxciv. ff., and others.

Three narratives stand at the head of the early Hebrew history closely connected with one another, and forming the initial point of the theocratic history: the creation of the world, the original condition of man, and the fall (Gen. i.—iii.). The different explanations, which they have received, may be divided in general into two classes; that which holds to the verbal sense, and that which abandons it. We have here to do only with the former, as that which alone is hermeneutically true. It again is twofold, the *mythical*, which takes for granted the historical untruth of the record, and the strictly *historical*, which is opposed to that.

The histories of every known people, and of the Asiatic nations in particular, bear in their commencement a greater or less resemblance to that which we find in the Biblical account. Now the relation of the former to the latter may be either that of original statements, or of derived: in the latter case indeed a twofold supposition again is possible; it has either arisen in the Pre-Mosaic period, and in that case by transference from a foreign quarter, or it proceeds from the Post-Mosaic period. In the former case, however, it would at any rate stand ill with the *mythical* character of these narratives. For, since we regard the mythus not as a pure invention (which it has never been), but as a given thing previously existing, the time of its origin and that of its subject stand in evident disproportion; for if these accounts were indigenous amongst the Hebrew patriarchs, it is an important step towards the proof of their *credibility*, which destroys the mythical character assigned them.

But both these cases are at the outset equally embarassed by an important difficulty. The case of one nation borrowing the mythi of another is not merely conceivable in itself, but has been actually proved. In the Grecian mythology *e. g.* the acquaintance of that people with foreign nations affords not only the proof of the influence of the latter on the former, but even pretty certain traces of the origin of the Grecian mythi according to historical data.[1] But how did this happen, as relates to its more general and deeper ground of explanation? It is in the internal unity of heathenism with itself, and in the syncretic tendency which is deeply rooted in it, that we have to seek for the source of this appropriation of that

1 Comp. K. O. Müller, Prolegom. zu. e. wissenschaftl. Mythol. p. 173, ff.

which was cognate and allied. From a consciousness, however, of the diametrical opposition of the fundamental idea of the Theocracy to the heathen element, the attempt is made to employ the favourable inclination of the Israelites to heathenism as the explanatory reason of the fact referred to. But is it among that portion of the people who served Baalim that we are to seek the idea of the Theocracy? That lies precisely in the element that is directly opposed to idolatry. But now comes the question, how, at the foundation of the Theocracy or subsequently, the untheocratic element which is opposed to it, gained such a preponderance as to be placed at the head of the theocratic idea? To the present time this problem remains unsolved, nay, its nature and extent have not even been comprehended; but, from the nature of the subject, it will and must remain for ever insoluble to the modern anti-theocratic tendency.

The traditions that have survived, exclusive of the Scriptures, concerning the original state of the earth and of man, bear as great a similarity as dissimilarity to the scriptural account. The explanation of *both* these phenomena depends on the decision to which we come concerning the mythical, or historical, character of that account. The mythus, however, as well as history, has both its ideal and its real side: in the one, the idea is so interwoven with the fact, that it appears itself a fact; in the other, the idea lies at the bottom of the fact and is deducible from it. We shall then have to establish the comparison between them with regard to both these points, in order to obtain a sure result; since the *ideal* elements of the mythus and the history have invariably an essential and specific difference (as in the one case they give possibility to the history, in the other to the mythus), while the amount of *fact* must be discussed in its single details in an effective manner, as every mythus has an element of fact in it, but history contains nothing else but what is fact.

1. If the *idea* of the Bible cosmogony is not only different from that of all other cosmogonies, but at the same time also such as to account for the origin of all the rest, while the reverse cannot be established, this marks it as the *original*. All these cosmogonies are founded on the non-recognition of the existence and life of God in relation to the existence and life of the creature; hence the idea of emanation, in various modifications, pervades them all;

being found in its most spiritual form in the Indian and Persian cosmogonies, and in one more rude and grotesque in the Phœnician, Babylonian, Egyptian, &c. traditions, which suffer Hylotheism [the deification of matter] to appear more plainly. *To the idea of a creation out of nothing no ancient cosmogony has ever risen,* neither in the mythi nor in the philosophemata of the old world.[1] Hence it follows, that, in describing the origin of the world, heathenism made no distinction, and could make none, between divine and created existence; its fundamental characteristic is the reference which it makes to the element of life in nature, which it accordingly regards as a concrete living thing, while it never conceives of the divine (*das Göttliche*) as a personally concrete living God. The peculiarity belonging to the Bible cosmogony, it having as its fundamental idea a *creation out of nothing*, places it at once in an entirely different category from all other ancient mythi. Hence most recently there appears to be a disposition above all, to deny the existence of that statement in the history of creation;[2] but certainly without success.

But then it is established also with the most perfect certainty, that all that is extra-biblical may be explained by this idea of its own from the biblical element, but not *vice versa*; for it is truth and not falsehood that is original, as the latter is only *a growth upon* the former: the biblical account therefore necessarily occupies the place of the original, occasioning and accounting for the existence of the other, which appears only as the secondary and derived account.

2. Every non-biblical cosmogony also proves itself to be a national one, peculiar to one or another people, by its connection partly with the entire mythological system peculiar to the same, partly with the

1 Comp. Schelling, The Deities of Samothracia (German) p. 58 ff. Görres, Mythengesch. p. 633, ff. Von Bohlen, d. A. Ind. i. p. 162, ff. Münter, Rel. d. Babylon. p. 44, &c.

2 It is only by the most violent exegetical methods that this idea can be banished from Gen. i. 1. For the word בראשית evidently denotes the beginning of created existence, (the creation *in* and with time) in opposition to the everlasting existence of the Creator (v. Gabler, Urgesch. i., p. 183. ff.); and so ברא (in Kal) constantly means *to call a new thing into being*, as in this respect also it is expressly distinguished from עשה, ii. 3.—"omnis creatio est effectio, sed non omnis effectio creatio," De Dieu ad h. l.; —comp. the excellent remark of Gesenius, Thes. i., p. 236. Hence Johannsen (Kosmogonische Ansichten der Inder und Hebräer. Altona 1833.) could only by a perversion of the meaning of ברא find the Indian idea of emanation in Hebraism; or Schumann *e. g.* seek to help himself by the following truly *narrow-minded* observation: uneque credibile

characteristics of the locality[1] and climate.[2] But amidst this manifold diversity there reigns a higher unity, referring back the whole to a common centre; the additions, rising upon one another in ever new formations, thrown up by a peculiar active power from the soil of each region, have in them an old primitive form, which is the animating principle of those delineations. But their whole formation is thus of a character always limited and closely confined; and when transplanted to a foreign soil, and there undergoing a mixture with new formations, maintains a difficult existence, ceasing to possess spontaneous freedom and vigour. The truth therefore lies only in that which is general and common to them all, not in the special shape which they have. It is, therefore, only this general fundamental idea that can be taken into consideration, when we attempt to combine the biblical and non-biblical cosmogonies.

The mythological is always national, particular, and limited; to the theocratical alone belongs true universality, as in that it has its commencement and completion; and it is this connection that gives the character of peculiar truth to the historical form of the Theocracy. Consequently, the reference of the history of the creation to the Theocracy, and in its forms and outlines as well as its essential principle (as we have evidence of this in the *seven days* of creation, the attributing what was made to *Jehovah*, and the anthropological representation), is of such a nature as likewise to impress upon it the stamp of historical truth, from the Theocracy being in a peculiar manner historically true. Without that reference it also would be mythology, and thus merely particular, and therefore also not true in its concrete shape; but its theocratic aim, far from rendering it suspicious and uncertain, imparts to it on the contrary objective truth.

Thus, on the one hand, we see that what appears a singularity in the history of the creation, is no other than an element of true

est, auctorem cujus in is ceter tanta cernitur philosophandi infantia, hîc de mundi origine ea cogitasse, *quae non cogitabant vel sagacissimi Graecorum philosophi* (assuredly they least of all!), cf. Cic de nat. deorum. i. 12, sq., *et nulla antiqua cosmogonia manifestavit.*"

1 Compare *e. g.* the cosmogony of the Egyptians calculated wholly for Egypt (in Diod. Sic. i. 7); that of the Babylonians made entirely for Mesopotamia: Münter, l. c. p. 37, ff.

2 Upon the local and independent character of the mythi O. Müller, in the work already quoted, has made some very fine remarks, without overlooking their universal character and connection, v. especially p. 281, ff.

universality, which therefore removes it from the category of all the other non-biblical cosmogonies, and places it on firm ground of its own. But hence, on the other hand, what we find as a general principle in these cosmogonies—the chaos, the relationship of man's nature to God, &c.—must not be explained from the peculiarity of each, since it is an element common to them all; though in the special ingredients associated with this generality we meet with what is purely subjective and national, which, as being untheocratic and therefore not universal, is also untrue. Hence it follows, from a comparison of it with the heathen cosmogonies, that the Mosaic maintains an altogether peculiar position amongst them, and therefore cannot be what they are, *Tradition and Mythus*, but stands related to both these as the original *i.e.* as *History*.

3. It is quite plain, that the history of the creation claims to be regarded as history, and not either as poetry or as philosophy. It is only by internal reasons that it could be shewn to be one of these two. For such a view could be vindicated only by carrying it out with consistency, and determining to take up the whole theocratic history as a theocratic poem, or as theocratic philosophy; by doing which it would destroy itself, since it would thus do away with the general distinction between history, and poetry or philosophy. But the history of the creation has just this peculiar distinction, that it handles its theme neither in an abstract form nor from a subjective point of view, but in the method of concrete historical treatment; thus rendering the abstract and the subjective *possible*, as to their fundamental idea, as well as its historical representation, while it disclaims identity with them. Both the abstract philosophic conception of the theme and the subjective asthetic conception of it, are *deductions* from history, and each is true only so far as it is rooted, and has its concrete truth in the history; which shows the history itself not to be the derived, but the original thing. But were the history as such untrue, so also would be that which is deduced from it and rests upon it; and, in place of objective historical truth, we should have heterogeneous subjective notions.

4. But, again, it may easily be discerned that the idea of a crea-

1 As *e. g.* Von Bohlen does, d. alte Indien i. p. 215, ff.; certainly the most perverted of all the modes of mythological treatment!

tion out of nothing, which lies at the foundation of this history, can *alone* lay claim to historical truth; since all other systems, as they invariably assume one of two forms, that of Hylozoism or Dualism, and that of the pantheistic doctrine of emanation or evolution, involve a contradiction of history, *i.e.* of what has happened, since they substitute for the notion of time that of eternity. Hence it belongs only to the Scriptural account, by the right definition of the temporal existence of the world in relation to God the Eternal, and of the specific distinction between the Creator and the creature, to deliver to us a history of created being, while the opposite view is excluded from the rank of history by the very fact referred to.

According to this character of peculiar internal independence which the Mosaic record possesses, we must give an unconditional rejection to the view of those, who regard it as a production that came into the hands of the Hebrews from a foreign quarter, and underwent a revision with them.[1] For apart from the circumstance that it carries in itself its own contradiction,[2] this argument confines itself simply to pointing out a foreign *colouring* in the narrative. Even in this, assertions that are decidedly false are brought forward, such as that of the foreign character of the Cherubim, while they unquestionably belong to the class of sacred symbols found in the theocratical worship. But apart from this, all that is only what is secondary and external,—the historical clothing: the fundamental element shows itself to be decidedly theocratical. Even those parts of the narrative, however, are evidence that our history is not of a limited cast, transplanted from without into the domestic soil, otherwise it would have assigned to those historical traits of the description of Eden, its geographical situation, &c., the national character and point of view belonging to Canaan. Here, therefore, the record, with all its theocratic design, is raised far above a narrow historical exhibition of it; which could only be, because it has set out from the central point of the Theocracy, otherwise it would have become pure mythology. But through laying hold of the principle

1 Comp. Hartmann, l. c. p. 788, ff., who regards the Phœnician cosmogony as the source of the Hebrew, and Von Bohlen, pp. 46—50, who maintains the Upper Asiatic Parsee origin of it.

2 C. iv., according to Von Bohlen (p. 53), must be written with a hostile feeling, precisely against the principles of the Zend religion concerning agriculture, &c,—and we are to suppose that the primitive traditions were derived by the Hebrews from the religious system here assailed, and found among them a willing reception.

of the Theocracy, it becomes a record which truly embraces a universal interest, to which it thus gives the stamp of truth.

The view, which disputes the historical character of this account, contains, according to its common form, this contradiction also, that it takes for granted, on the one hand, the *artificialness* of the plan of the whole, and, on the other hand, the *simplicity* of this conception of the world, employing the latter in accounting for the internal contradictions, and consequently the unhistorical character of the document, and the former for the late fabrication of part of the contents.[1] Now an artificial plan is manifestly at variance with the supposition of contradictions, which in that case would certainly have been avoided; while the simplicity that we discover in going through the work, loudly protests against admitting the fact of later invention. Hence no view but such as that of De Wette was consistent,[2] who discovers here the "Introduction to the theocratic Epos of the Hebrews," retaining only the artificial plan of the whole and its genuine theocratic design. Then, however, all that is required is to show that the idea "Theocratic Epos" involves a contradiction,—inasmuch as the Theocracy was so far from being a form of the fancy, that, on the contrary, it is the truest historical phenomenon of all the facts of antiquity, and we are placed on the only right standing point (the theocratic = the historical).

In the consistent carrying out of the view that opposes the historical character of the account, the removal of the pretended contradictions in the work is as binding on the supporters of it as upon us, because these destroy the artistic unity quite as much as the historical. And in fact all contradictions of that kind (exclusive of those that are said to occur in Gen. i. and ii. as two different documents) rest partly on philological mistake;[3] partly on a shallow dogmatic mode of treatment, as it was not considered agreeable to reason that God had made the creation in six *days*, or that he had *rested*;[4]—this mode of treatment, however, has

1 Comp. *e. g.* Gabler in der Urgesch. Th. i., Bauer, Hebr. Mythol. 1, p. 63, ff. et al.

2 Beiträge, Th. ii. p. 36, ff.

3 As in the pretended difference between ver. 4 and ver. 14, where simply, in the right apprehension of אֵת and מֵאֵת, we have the key to the reconciliation of the two passages.

4 Of this description we may read examples in Ammon's Bibl. Theol. i. p. 266, ff., where these views are very justly designated as *Mohammedan, i. e.* purely *deistic*.

not been extended to the ראשית of the history of creation, since there it finds its full refutation: the commencement, the fact that time receives its existence through the creation, determines the creation as being *in* time, which thus obtains its *reality;* and the real existence of time is therefore precisely that which our record, according to its given fundamental idea, must take for granted and carry out;—partly, in fine, on a perverted and partial view of the natural science of our record, which overlooks the essential nature both of that science, as being one that attains to purely negative results,[1] and of the record also, which certainly may be the foundation of natural science, as religion in general may be of life, and the church of the state, but not *vice versa.*

As with the history of the Creation, so is it also with the account of the Fall. Here also there can properly be but two opposite views; the mythical, which asserts the historical impossibility of the narrative, and the historical view. The former, as before, but here more particularly, rests on dogmatic prejudices that are quite subjective. Thus the question is put by Hartmann (p. 381, ff.); whether it be reconcileable with God's omniscience and love, to entice the first human beings to evil?—of which there is nothing in the record, and which no truly intelligent expositor has ever found in it. The introduction of the serpent is made an objection, as if it were possible for us, supposing the Fall to be actually true, to pronounce respecting that fact, while the objection rests only on the basis of a supposition that no fall has actually taken place, and thus reasons in a circle. The sentence pronounced is regarded as involving a false conception, since the punishments are not "real evils," but "are entirely natural effects of appointments of nature, which have God alone for their author,"—thus denying the actual existence of evil, and attributing it in the grossest manner to God. That the threatening of death is not fulfilled, is another objection, which arises out of a wrong understanding of the passages that refer to it, &c.

If the Creation is the first wonder of time, the second is the origin

1 Comp. the excellent essay, "Theology and Natural Science" (by Carl von Raumer), in the Evang. K. Zeitung, 1830, Nr. 50, ff. See also for this and what follows the many hints in the Essay: Was ist das Resultat d. Wissensch. in Bezug auf die Urwelt? [What are the conclusions of science in reference to the primitive world?] in Thol.'s Lit. Anzeig. 1833, Nr. 67, ff.

of that new element, which extends through all generations, the entrance of evil into the pure creation, the defilement of that which was formed good by the first sin. As the history of creation can possess complete truth, only where the idea of the Creator and the creature is a true one, so also can the history of the Fall, only where the idea of good and evil may be discovered in its true form, where the history proves itself to be true in its idea. If we observe how the sacred record accounts for the introduction of evil, we find everywhere in it the direct opposition of Good and Evil, the holy and unspotted character of God, and the good brought into being by him, in opposition to that which has *become* evil,—to the apostacy from God of the original life in God, as an historical event. In the accounts of antiquity, apart from the Biblical element, sin appears in its origin either as an eternal thing,[1] or as an unreal thing; a view, which no more than the later Manichæism and Pelagianism,[2] can have or gain an historical foundation, which indeed it voluntarily renounces. It is only where the statement of the creation possesses truth, where the finitude and the individual life of man are apprehended as they are in Gen. ii. 7, that the first sin is *possible:* it is only where, coming to man from without, it appears not founded in himself, that the nature of sin is recognized, its introduction represented as at once possible and real; and, therefore, its history established as true.

But whoever should be disposed to doubt that the character of positive fact belongs to the historical account of the first sin, because it contains something *miraculous,*[3] would show his ignorance of the nature of the fact itself; whoever should desire that the first sin should come about in a natural manner, would have the first sin itself regarded as a natural thing, while, on the contrary, it was just that kind of thing which is unnatural, and which has only *become* natural. But those who would understand a part of the fact symbolically and another part in its proper sense, are guilty of an arbitrary hermeneutical procedure, not considering that there is nothing whatever in the text to justify such an interpretation; for

1 Dualism is deeply rooted in the nature of the oriental mythi, and there assumes the most various forms. V. Görres, Mythengesch. p. 635, ff. Creuzer, Symbolick ii. p. 4, ff.

2 *E. g.* the Egyptian, Phœnician, and Babylonian traditions relative to this were of a Pelagian character (v. Münter, l. c., p. 43); those of Parsism and Brahmaism, Manichœan.

3 Which *e. g.* is the strain of the whole of Gabler's deduction. Urgesch. ii. 1, p. 73, ff.

to question the reality of a "tree of life" and of "the knowledge of good and evil," because of that ethical appellation, can be vindicated only by the demonstration of the inadmissibility of the connection of the ethical element with the physical, which are, however, mutually related as spirit and body.

As the account of Paradise in its external facts has generally been preserved in the form of a traditionary tale, apart from Scripture, without a profound dogmatic-ethical significance,[1] so also has the Fall in its historical representation lost in heathenism the purity of the truth that is stamped upon the narrative of the Bible; but traces of the form are still remarkably discernible in all the mythi. "*Almost all the nations of Asia,*" says Von Bohlen (A. Indien i. p. 248) "*assume the serpent to be a wicked being, which has brought evil into the world.*" And indeed it is remarkable what a similarity is observable between the traditionary tales of Egypt, India, Persia, and even of the northern nations (which are again met with in the Orphic mysteries of the West), and the old Hebrew narrative. Where, then, is the original in the case? To this the answer is given: it is to be found there, where at the present time every year these contests with serpents are repeated, to prevent the destructive reptile from gaining the upper hand; and this takes place in Northern Persia, Bactria, and India.[2] In point of fact, a more paltry view could not well be given, and even in our day it can hardly count on more extended approval. Or—to touch here on only one historical fact—how would one explain it according to *this* view, that in the Asiatic religions the serpent appears as often as *ἀγαθοδαίμων* as it does as *κακοδαίμων*? Again the answer is; from the locality. Well; but then let the necessary consequence be admitted, that the locality may indeed be capable of modifying the general element, but never of producing it; that the variety of that which we find native to the different places, supposes a higher unity, from which it has received its existence and conditions. This, however, can never be found in the individuality which is confined to *nature and the worship of nature,* but in the higher religious element which gives rise to that, which

1 This is most plainly shown in the geographical description of Paradise when compared with the tales of other nations.

2 So Von Bohlen, l. c. p. 249; Genes. p. 37, ff., 48, ff. It is the same with the trees of Paradise, only not to so great an extent in the range of mythi known to us. V. Von Bohlen, p. 39.

111850

shows its influence in the separate forms as a common principle deeply implanted in the breast of man, along with the impression of the peculiarity of the individual, the race, and the people. Hence, on the contrary, the local religious conception, the more it appears in its most proper sense as such, is only a *transference* of the general to the local, the conjunction of the *general* higher element of life with all the ingredients of the native soil. And as he would have a very imperfect understanding of the circle of a people's religious belief, who was acquainted simply with the nature and climate of their country, and conceived of their spirit as a thing of merely passive formation, instead of acquiring a knowledge of their whole mode of thinking and feeling and acting; as little would he, who knew the peculiar form of a single nation's faith merely in its separate characteristics, without placing it in connection with another common and cognate form. But it is this very circumstance, that in the Hebrew narrative no such local modification is found, that it contains not a physical or any kind of subordinate element, but one of a purely dogmatic-ethical nature; which takes away from it a local character, and gives it that which is general, thus marking it as the original.

Hence also the more recent expositors have felt above all the necessity of endeavouring to attach a false and partial explanation to this peculiar element of the Biblical record.[1] Now there are two fundamental ideas exhibited in the record: that of *sin*, which is represented by the tempter, according to its nature, as the endeavour to be like God (iii. 5), its rise is the questioning of God's word (iii. 1), its consequence, alienation from God and death (ii. 17, iii. 8, 16, ff.), all moral and physical evil; a truth which lies at the bottom of the history, giving it such internal unity, that this narrative in truth forms the initial point of all that follows, and were it to fall, the whole history in general would be destroyed. Contrasted with the sin in its initial point, stands the *salvation*; and the prediction of the seed of the woman has so close a connection with the whole subsequent development of the idea of salvation, that here also we should be perplexed, if this record did not enable us to trace that back to its earliest commencement.

1 Von Bohlen has gone farthest in this: according to him it is the meaning of the record, that the fruit did man good (p. 39), that man now becomes as it were (?) of age; the text seeks only to explain the first external institutions of human society (p. 40), &c.

§ 16. CONTINUATION. GEN. IV.—IX.

The first records of Genesis place us at once on a sure historical standing-point, since they enable us to understand the relation of man to God, the basis of all true history, which must begin, not with nature, but with God. In this way we are furnished with the principle of the subsequent history, bearing on the relation of men to the Deity, to one another, and to nature. All these relations are expressed in the history of Cain and Abel: there we have the rite of *sacrifice* in its commencement, its character represented in its two-fold form, and the expression of the idea[1] lying at the bottom of that in the different *mode of life* of the two brothers: the discord connected with this; the fratricide; the contest of man with nature, and the civilization introduced by it; the consequent increase of impiety, the apostacy from the living God, the abandonment of man to a natural mode of life in opposition to the simple and pious worship of Jehovah.

There is certainly an opposite, and really heathenish view of history, which represents man in the contrary way as advancing from a condition of brutish savageness to civilization, the corruption and moral perversion of which it does not understand, but regards as the noblest aim of humanity. This view cannot possibly see anything else in our history than "a violent leap;" it might even very well, from its narrow-minded subjective point of view, find a main proof in it of the mythical contents of the narrative.[2] This view readily supplies its own refutation, as it rests on a doctrinal falsehood; but it claims *experience* as its chief support, and supposes it has found in that an impregnable position.

Accordingly it argues in the following strain. "Agriculture supposes an advanced state of civilization, and so does the series of

1 The unbloody offering of Cain stands in a remarkable agreement with the expression: "my sin is greater than can be taken away" (iv. 13). Comp. concerning the primitive idea of atonement in sacrifice, Müller, l. c., p. 258, ff.

2 Comp. Vater, Comment. i., p. 39. Hartmann, p. 392, ff. Von Bohlen, p. 51, ff. The latter most strangely imposes his view even on Scripture: "Man came *out of a brutish condition* to the possession of knowledge." If it really stood thus in Gen. i.—iii., certainly Gen. iv. could not follow; but the proof it still remains for this author to supply.

arts and inventions that are here mentioned;[1] the building of cities also, and the working in metals, are equally unsuitable to so early a period." In opposition to this, what say the testimonies of the *ancients?* According to the Phœnician tradition, the invention of agriculture and the arts with the discovery of metals, &c., is referred to their early mythic period, and ascribed to the first men (Sanchoniathon in Euseb., Pr. Ev. i. 10); so the Egyptian tradition places the origin of music and metallurgy in the time when Osiris ruled (Diod. Sic. i. p. 15. Plato de legg. ii. p. 577); and it is well known that among the Greeks these events were entirely attributed to the mythic age.[2] If we enquire of *the investigators of history,* they completely agree with these accounts. "The history of the Cainites and Sethites is at bottom nothing but an authentication of the two *most ancient modes of life,* which are called in the Arabic language that of the Bedouins and that of the Kabyles, and which to this day in the East are distinguished from each other by their contrary tendencies." (Herder, Werke iv. p. 330). "The origin of agriculture—says Link, (die Urwelt [the Primitive World] 2nd Ed., 1834, i. p. 399, ff.[3])—is lost in the mythic age; in an age, of which nothing but traditionary tales have reached history; and there is nothing strange in that, for *agriculture, fixed settlements and houses, precede the rise of history;* the external condition must first be established, before the attempt is made to perpetuate the memory of the internal condition. *Everywhere we find that it was a deity who taught men to till the ground,* and pointed out to them those fruits the cultivation of which would be especially useful to them," &c. From this "it follows," (says the same learned writer, p. 450), "that the discovery of the breeding of cattle, of agriculture, and of the preparation of metals, belongs to an ante-historic period; and besides, *that in this historic period they have made comparatively no great advances. The spread and origin of these departments of knowledge is almost as remarkable as the origin* of the different forms of plants and their spread, or as the origin and spread of the specific varieties of the

[1] "A greater ignorance and confusion of history can hardly be imagined, than here obtrudes itself on our view on every side," says Hartmann, p. 394.

[2] As the Mythus of Vulcan and the Telchines shows; v. Buttmann, Mythologus i., p. 164, ff. Creuzer, Symb. ii., p. 304, ff., and so that of Ceres, Apollo, &c.

[3] Comp. also Schlosser, Universalhist. Uebers. [German translation of the Universal History], i., p. 30, ff.

human race." Thus Schlosser likewise (l. c. p. 49, ff.) declares himself very decidedly in favour of the opinion that there existed an art of architecture in primitive antiquity, and against the notion of men being originally Troglodytes, &c. This, then, will make it evident how partial and biassed *theologians* are in their decision, as it agrees only with *their* aims, in comparison with the investigators of nature and with historians, who otherwise stand on a like ground with them!

But the narrative in Gen. iv. must also contain manifest traces of a mythical character. In ver. 14, Cain's fear must be unfounded, "since besides his parents there was no human being dwelling on the wide earth." To this Clericus supplies the appropriate answer: "Designat Adami familiam quæ ei infensa erat." Indeed, it is in general clear from the account itself, that the record supposes Adam to have had a larger family (ver. 17), with which ch. v. 4 also is in exact agreement.[1] Why then continually borrow from pure *fictions* such truly silly objections to the sacred history? But the song of Lamech, and the "elevated consideration which in ver. 7 is put in the mouth of Jehovah," must be looked upon as inadmissible for so early an age. The former, however, is so obscure, and to us enigmatical (as even Von Bohlen, p. 61, is obliged to confess), that it rather supplies a striking testimony to the antiquity of the record; nothing of the like sort is fabricated in a later age, as Hartmann thinks (p. 396), and the examples which he adduces should have demonstrated the opposite of that assertion.[2] So ver. 7 also is quite in the spirit of the period, the figure being drawn from *pastoral life*.[3]

Lastly, it is affirmed that the object of that narrative proves it to be mythical; for it is directed against the nations of Upper Asia that did not respect the worship of Jehovah, and against their agrarian mode of life, arising out of the unfavourable disposition entertained by the Israelites towards it. Along with this we have the Levitical character of the narrator, who, accustomed to his own animal sacrifices, looks down slightingly on offerings of the fruits

1 "It cannot be denied that בנים ובנות there may denote children born before Seth, quite as well as such as were born after him."—Hensler, Bemerkk. üb. St. d. Pss. und der Gen. [Remarks on passages of the Psalms and Genesis], p. 268. Winer also, Reallex. i., p. 758, gives a more unprejudiced decision here.

2 This example at the sametime shows, how carefully our author maintains the distinction between history and poetry. V. Pareau, de myth. S. C. int., p. 214.

3 V. Hensler, l. c., p. 271, ff.

and flowers of the earth. (Von Bohlen, p. 53, ff.) Now in this there is a dishonest contradiction. As the Theocracy in its external reference to the land of Canaan was essentially based on agriculture,[1] it is in fact impossible to see how a writer living amidst these relations, and (according to the opposite view) completely devoted to them, could here, all at once, be so inconsistent with his part, when there was besides no occasion for his belying himself here. This circumstance is a very striking proof, that the author was concerned with the pure objective representation of the ante-theocratic history, and that in this respect he quite assumes an ante-theocratic position, as if it were natural to him. Besides, his object is anything but an external one of a national and geographical character. This is clearly shown by iv. 26, which can be referred only to the deeply pious disposition of the Sethites;[2] and no one can deny that a nomadic race could preserve that thoughtful simplicity much better than could be done in the opposite mode of life; and that in that ancient mode of sacrifice which Abel exemplified, a deeper religious view is displayed than in that of Cain.[3]

Let us add now to this historical character of the narrative, which is in itself so well supported in every view, the traditionary tales of the Phœnicians concerning the enmity of the brothers Hypsuranios and Uson (Sanchon. in Euseb. l. c.); those of the Greeks about Apollo, and the ideas connected with him relating to the invention of music, but above all, those relating to *atonement by blood*;[4] and even of the Tschudi, among whom is found a sort of reversed tradition of Cain;[5] and we cannot hesitate to affirm that our history is verified beyond doubt as being the original, and that it alone throws a clear light on the dark and confused mass of the traditions of antiquity, from which we can elicit only single sparks.

The contents of ch. v. are attacked on several grounds. The

1 Comp. Michaelis, Mos. Recht [on the Laws of Moses], i. p. 249, ff.

2 Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. ii., p. 345.

3 In which it appears to us every way worthy of observation, that the earliest period of heathenism seems to have held chiefly to *unbloody* offerings. Comp. Porphyr. de abstin. ii. 5, ff. Creuzer, Symb. i., p. 172; ii., p. 129, 137, ff. How was it possible for a later age to set forth with such simplicity and truth, as is done here in Genesis, this idea, certainly a very early one in the East, which was opposed to a bloody sacrificial ritual that degenerated into what was abominable?

4 V. E. O. Müller, Prolegg. p. 304.

5 V. Fr. von Schlegel, Philos. d. Gesch. i. p. 51, ff.

great age of the patriarchs is remarked, in the first place, as an indication of the mythical. These representations, it is said, ought not to be banished from the text by arbitrary suppositions, but they are shown to be unhistorical by *physiology* and *history*.[1] As relates to physiologists, they have by no means expressed themselves with such confident assumption on this point as theologians: Haller discovers here a "*problema ob paucitatem datorum insolubile*" (Elem. Physiol. viii. § 21), Buffon regards it as possible (Hist. Nat. iv. p. 358), and lastly, Link also, whom no one will reproach with partiality to revelation, declares that we have at least gained "clearer insight" into the physiological constitution of the men of the primitive world by the discoveries that have recently been made (Urwelt, i. p. 81). In such circumstances we prefer, with Pareau,[2] to listen to what *history* says. There the Bible account finds its most splendid confirmation. When Josephus found the accounts of the Egyptian, Phœnician, Babylonian, and Grecian historians, whom he adduces by name, in agreement with that of Scripture, and made the assertion *μαρτυροῦσι δέ μου τῷ λόγῳ πάντες ὅι παρ' Ἕλλησι καὶ παρὰ βαρβάροις συγγραψάμενοι τὰς ἀρχαιολογίας*,[3] he had good need (and we not less) to say in opposition to his sceptical age: *μηδεὶς δὲ πρὸς τὸν νῦν βίον καὶ τὴν βραχύτητα τῶν ἐτῶν ἃ ζῶμεν συμβαλὼν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν, ψευδῆ νομιζέτω τὰ περὶ ἐκείνων λεγόμενα*. To these testimonies it must be added that, in Genesis itself, in the life of Jacob (xlvii. 9), a complaint is made of the decreasing length of man's life, as also again in the Mosaic psalm (Ps. xc. 10).[4] The greatest importance also belongs to the passage Gen. vi. 3, which supplies an explanation of this point in

1 So *e. g.* Bredow, Untersuchungen etc. i. p. 1, ff. Bauer, Hebr. Myth. i. p. 197, ff. Hartmann, p. 401, ff. Von Bohlen, p. 65. Winer Reallex. i. p. 626, &c.

2 "Tu qui illud hodie ita esse ex anatomicis observationibus merito colligas, quo tandem jure affirmes, nunquam id aliter fuisse?—Ego certe qui hoc non ex hodiernis medicorum observationibus calculisve æstimandum, sed *historice* dijudicandum esse, nullus dubito, non video quare in illa longævitate magnopere offendamus, *quæ veritatis historicæ satis perspicua habet indicia*." De myth. int. p. 144, sq.

3 Eudoxus, Varro, Diodorus, Pliny, and Plutarch, make the ancient years of the Egyptians to consist on that account of one month. "This account, however, appears to rest on no information, but *on a mere hypothesis which they invented to explain the long duration of life*, attributed to the gods and earliest men, mentioned in early Egyptian history." Ideler, Handbuch d. Chronol. i. p. 93. That Josephus also knew of this is clear from his words: *περὶ δε τούτων, ὡς ἄν ἑκάστοις ᾖ φίλον, ὕυτως σκοπείτωσαν*.

4 The meaning of the passage is very well given by Ewald, in such a way as to combine the internal inference with the external; die Pss. p. 34.

particular, as it expressly states the greatest age of man to have been fixed by a special divine decree at 120 years, as the consequence of the increasing depravity of the world: so that our record thus expressly directs attention to the fact, that the definite decree, influenced by divine justice on the one hand, and, on the other, by divine compassion, alone furnishes the complete explanation of that fact of the lengthening and shortening of the period of life.[1] No other old tradition, which informs us of the fact itself, has in this way *given the reason that accounts for it*, and presented it in this its higher necessity; which again confirms the Bible version as the only true one.

Farther, traces of the historical falsehood of this genealogy are said to be found in the nature of the thing, the inadmissibility of an exact chronology at so early a period, which can be no credible parent of such a chronology. (Vater i. p. 50.) Here again is an assertion, which is a direct contradiction of history, which shows us that astronomy and the division of time have their origin among all nations in an age entirely mythical; so that we must here again apply quite another standard than such poor ideas as the "invention," "advances," and "civilization" of our modern era. Where the division of time is so closely connected with religion and worship, as astronomy and astrology were in antiquity, the former as well as the latter is a sacred primitive tradition, whose origin is as much involved in mystery as that of the other.[3]

It is farther said that it is surprising that so few historical notices are here given us (Hartmann, p. 399), as if we had anything of the sort to expect in a *genealogy*,[4] or were in general justified in making such a demand, when we ought rather to regard it as a mark of genuine history, that no more is communicated than what just arose out of, and was suitable to, the purpose of the narration as a whole. It was mentioned, however, in iv. 26, as the statement there is true of all these patriarchs, that they remained faithful to Jehovah.

A good proof of the antiquity of this section lies in the nearly

1 V. excellent remarks on this in Fr. von. Schlegel l. c. p. 62, ff.

2 V. besides Josephus, the collections in Mitscherlich ad Hor. Od. i. 3, 32; Bähr ad Ctesiam. p. 311, ad Herod. iii. 23, p. 43.

3 Comp. also Jahn, Einl. ii. p. 119, ff.

4 The interruption caused by the account of Enoch's end was *necessary*, since the genealogist could not here repeat the constant expression וימת.

identical and similar names of the persons mentioned in the family series both of the Cainites and the Sethites.[1] This circumstance finds its appropriate explanation in the small number of the names that were in use in the old world; since many differ from one another only by a slight change, and many are quite the same. Overlooking this, the rash hypothesis has been built on that analogy of the names, that Genesis iv. and v. are one and the same family-register, and that the names of the Cainites and Sethites are simply interchanged in "confused order," and transferred to the one piece out of the other.[2] On the other hand consider, 1. The violence of this hypothesis, since to gain its object it must partly leave out names, and partly quite reverse their order. 2. The error that lies at the bottom of it, as if the names were quite alike, while on the contrary several are not so at all, as *Adam* and *Enosh*, יָרֶד and עִירָד, and others have only a partial similarity, as *Methushael* and *Methushelach*, *Mahalaleel* and *Mechuyael*; and the general uncertainty that prevails in a similarity of names of that kind.[3] 3. That it is quite impossible to imagine that any one who wished to give a loose and arbitrary representation of this matter, should have sought to obtain his object in this way, when it would have been much easier freely to invent, than to borrow from that family-register which formed a direct contrast to the other.

But the narrative of Enoch, v. 21–24, is chiefly laid hold of by more recent theologians as the most evident mythus, the principal support of which assertion is sought in the cognate traditions of Romulus, Ganymede, &c.[4] If we examine the propriety of this comparison, we shall find, 1, in reference to the *sources*, this great diversity, that here we have a simple, slight genealogy, there poetic tales, which therefore are partly the subject of further elaboration and adornment by later writers,[5] but are contradicted by the histo-

1 Compare the names Chanoch—Lamech—Cainan (Cain.)

2 So Buttmann, Mythologus, i. p. 170, ff. Von Bohlen, p. 59, ff.

3 "Besides, especial caution must be used in employing the similarity of names for clearing up obscure points of antiquity. Suppose, *e. g.*, that the obscure period of history reached as far as to the birth of Christ, how plausibly might it be made out that Cræsus and Crassus were one and the same person." Pustkuchen, Urgesch, i. p. 257.

4 Comp. Ruperti in Henke's Magazin vi. p. 174, ff. Winer, Reallex. i. p. 560, ff. Hartmann, p. 402. Schumann, V. Bohlen, &c.

5 Comp. *e. g.*, concerning the mythus of Ganymede, taken up in a purely artistic Greek spirit, and worked into different forms, Heyne ad Apollod. obss. p. 294. Hug über den Myth. p. 213.

rians.[1] 2. In reference to the fundamental *idea*, there is the distinction between them, that here we have a pure piety, a "walking with God," there the beauty of the mortal is the cause of his glorification (*τὸν ἀνηρείψαντο θεοὶ—κάλλεος ἕνεκα δῖο*, Hom. Il. xx. 234,) or the august eminence of the first ruler of Rome; here there is a simple removal from the earth, there the fundamentally different idea of an apotheosis. 3. In reference to other confirmatory *testimonies*; while the heathen parallels show themselves to be indigenous tales constructed according to the popular taste, here not only do we not meet with an analogous occurrence in the domestic history till a far later period in the account of Elijah, but *foreign* testimonies also, quite independent of the Scriptures, add their confirmation; to which belongs especially the very old tale, found in Phrygian authors, and extensively spread in that region, of Annakos or Nannakos, with which Buttmann very suitably compares the Greek tale of Æacus, tales which afford a fine proof of their being founded on the simple groundwork of the Bible fact.[2] We cannot therefore understand how one could here, with an utter want of criticism, jumble together things of the most different kind, and regard them as being of the same kind.

If we compare now with this genealogy the tradition, which we find among the Indians, the Chinese, the Egyptians, but in its plainest form among the Babylonians of ten ante-diluvian rulers, exalted by the mythology into gods (v. Von Bohlen, p. 67), we cannot hesitate to adopt the opinion, that history and mythology are here very plainly distinguished from one another, and that from the historical standing-point [= Scripture account] of the history of the flood, we may very well explain, how this mythical deification of the old world might be developed from that historical basis, but never the reverse, how the latter could be developed from the former: comp. Perizonius, Origg. Bab. et Aeg. ii., p. 25.

The opinion is very decidedly held that a mythus is contained in Gen. vi. 1—8, and certainly not without reason, if the "theogonic" and "mythologic" idea of "sons of gods," and the "widely-spread dogma of the theogony in the polytheistic religions of the ancient world," also found support in this passage. It is strange that the

1 As was the case with the Annalists in reference to Romulus; v. Niebuhr, Rom. Gesch. i. p. 261.

2 Comp. Buttmann, Mythol. i. p. 176, ff.

sobriety elsewhere evinced by our modern expositors is here exchanged for a willing acquiescence in the silliest whims of the Alexandrian Gnostics and Cabbalistic Rabbins, in order to make an attempt from that quarter to pervert and throw suspicion on Scripture truth. There is no trace of any such notion in our text. The article in בני־האלהים shows that it is not "sons of the *gods*" that are spoken of; it must therefore be at least "sons of *Jehovah*," who is also expressly referred to by that name in vers. 3, 5, 7, 8. Are these then "begotten by Jehovah," or is it in a moral sense that they are thus called "sons of Jehovah?" But where should we find in Scripture a single analogous example of a theogonic view of that kind? The application of the idea "sons of God" is everywhere a *moral* one (except where the contrary is expressly stated, Ps. ii. 7); why then should this passage form an exception? But it may be easily shown from the context also, that it is not superterrestrial beings, angels or such like, that are here at all to be thought of; and unquestionably the indefinite phrase בני־האלהים must receive its definition in the first place from the context. In vers. i. it is expressly the multiplication of men in general that is spoken of, and so also in v. 3; so that we can hardly avoid supposing "the sons of God," and "the daughters of men," in v. 2, to be two species of the genus referred to in the preceding and following verses. If we look now to the other part of the connection, we must evidently pass over the genealogies in ch. v., which interrupts the history, and join the passage with iv. 26. Here it is the progeny of Seth that is spoken of, and the worship of Jehovah which they practised; by which the narrator has evidently made sufficient preparation for the בני־האלהים, especially when in ver. 25 they are designated as *a whole*, a זֶרַע (comp. Deut. xiv. 1, Exod. iv. 22, 23). It is certainly not correct to take the phrase בנות האדם exactly in the sense in which it was commonly taken by the earlier defenders of our view—the daughters of sinful men, the descendants of Cain—but the expression naturally signifies—the daughters of the rest of mankind. "But (it is said) from the union of the two proceeds the race of the giants," which it is thought necessarily leads to the supposition of beings of a higher nature. This is decidedly incorrect. There is nothing in vi. 4 of a race of giants springing from this union. "In those days were the (well-known) *Nephilim* in the earth," cannot without violence re-

ceive such a reference, especially when what follows is taken into connection: "also after that, the sons of God went in unto the daughters of men," *i. e.*, at that time there were men of that kind, and they continued even till a later period. The author, to wit, clearly proves the corruption of the age from two characteristic circumstances; in the first place, from the mixture of the pious race of God's faithful people with the rest, and the apostacy of the former from Jehovah arising thence (just as in the case of Israel, "God's first-born son," it was the greatest sin to contract licentious and idolatrous connections with the Midianitish or other foreign women); secondly, from the violence (comp. vi. 11, the earth was not only corrupt, but also full of *violence* חָמָס) practised by that insolent race, forgetful of God, whose bodily strength (גִּבֹּרִים, נְפִילִים[1]) answered to their pride (אַנְשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם comp. xi. 4).

The history of the flood is also looked upon as mythus, which some refer entirely to the class of purely inventive tradition, giving up the attempt to make out any sort of historical element in it (comp. especially *De Wette*, Beitr. p. 70, ff.); others assign it a physico-astrological foundation, and accordingly take it for a foreign local tradition, springing up on the soil of India, and brought to the Hebrews through Babylon, after having first received a new colouring there.[2] Here, if anywhere, everything is combined which can give the Bible-narrative the stamp of the highest credibility. Consider only the following points: 1. The exact statement concerning the *ark*, and the mode of its construction, where we have not the slightest trace of mythical ornament, as we have *e. g.* in the Hellenic traditions of the Argo, Apollod. i. 9, 19, ff. The simplicity of this vessel is sufficiently clear from the account, vi. 14, ff., and it is quite in accordance with that period, as its colossal size also is quite in harmony with the primitive age and with the strength and duration of its erections, to us enigmatical. If we had not the monuments still partially before us, we should regard the *statements* of the ancients respecting them as hardly credible; and it

1 I confess that the common derivation from נָפַל *irruere* does not appear to me a natural one. At any rate that from the mutually related roots פָּלָא, פָּלַל, פּוּל seems more probable, according to which the fundamental meaning would be *ingens*, of great distinguished stature, which at least very well suits Num. xiii. 32, 33.

2 Comp. Hartmann, p. 795, ff. Von Bohlen, p. 78. ff. Buttmann, Mythol. i. p. 190, 200, ff.

would then appear to what lengths we should be carried by that art of calculation that is founded on the contracted and diminutive standing-point of the present: were it not in our power still to view with our eyes the ruins of Thebes, the narratives of the royal city of a hundred gates would undoubtedly be referred to the region of the fabulous. Yet the relation of these monuments to those that are recent, is quite the same as of this Bible fact to the modern art of ship-building, especially as our narrative says nothing of a ship, but only of an *ark* (תֵּבָה). It is only the scoffing frivolity of the enemies of revelation that would think of doubting the accomplishment of such an undertaking.[1] Add to this, that the calculations made by excellent mathematicians in reference to it, show that the size of the ark bore a suitable proportion to the number of the beasts contained in it, as it is demonstrated that more than 6600 kinds of animals would have had room in it.[2] This fact has remained till now unrefuted, as from its nature it cannot be otherwise. So also it is not merely an hypothesis, adopted by enquirers into nature, but it is proved by facts, that the climate of the antediluvian age was one different from ours, in respect to the variety of changeable zones, as an equable, tropical climate prevailed through the whole earth; and from that, the reception of the different kinds of beasts in the ark, which in itself is quite conceivable and probable, obtains practical confirmation.[3] 2. The exact statement of the natural causes that concurred in the Deluge, is a circumstance which certainly in nowise removes the miraculous nature of the whole fact—who has unveiled the mysteries of Nature?—but which certainly shows, how exact was the attention paid to the external phenomena of the Deluge; v. Pareau, l. c. p. 149. 3. The statements (exactly agreeing with what has been observed of the remains and traces of a deluge) of the universality of the Flood, though not of such an effect resulting from it, as a change of firm land into sea and the reverse; the fearful might of the flood, exactly harmonizing with the statement of the height of the waters, &c.; prove

[1] Celsus formerly scoffed at it, and in recent times Voltaire, and with these "thinking heretics" Von Bohlen joins.

[2] Comp. Temporarius in Heidegger Hist. s. patriarch. p. 338, sq., and particularly Lilienthal, die gute Sache d. göttlich. offenb. Th. v.

[3] Comp. K. Von Raumer's Lehrb. d. allgem. Geographie, p. 411, 427. 2te Ausg.

how fully our information is founded on facts,[1] and when compared with the slight and shallow objections against it, make the littleness of these very manifest. 4. The careful statement of the chronology, which marks with such exactness day and month in the course of this occurrence, puts all suspicion of the history to shame.

To these are added some important circumstances that remarkably confirm this genuine historical character. (*a*) If we reckon the days and months, as they are stated in the time mentioned in the history of the flood, which embraces exactly the space of a year, we obtain 384 days, which statement of time suits only if we regard that year as *a complete intercalary year of lunar months.*[2] Now such a year must also be supposed in the Mosaic legislation, if the cycle of feasts is to receive its explanation,[3] but nowhere in the promulgation of the Law is mention made of this arrangement of the year, though it is besides so closely connected with the celebration of the feasts; which can be explained only by its being known to the Israelites, so that with them it was necessarily presupposed. Thus the subsequent history casts a brilliant light on this part, giving it confirmation; and we have thus a very just *demonstration* of its truth. Add to this (*b*) that here the months are simply *numbered*, and not named; now names were given to the months by the Hebrews evidently long before the Exile: indeed, so early as the time of Moses a name was given to the first month of the year (Abib, Ear-month, Exod. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18; Deuter. xvi. 1); while here, on the contrary, the same appears simply as the first month, which is another trait that exactly suits the order of time in these facts. Hence it is clear how thankless are the labours of those who, from the chronological statements here given, would draw the conclusion that the account belongs to a later age, as Von Bohlen does, p. 105—110; who, reckoning here incorrectly a year of 365 days, discovers that the Hebrews were not acquainted with it before the Exile, and then places the commencement of the year of the Flood at the autumnal equinox, in the month Tisri, for which latter opinion there is no foundation

1 Comp. Von Raumer's work quoted above, p. 395—431, which no theologian who gives *unqualified* belief to geologists and enquirers into nature can read without profit.

2 Comp. the exact and excellent calculation in Tiele, die Genesis übers. und comment. i. p. 149, with p. 209, ff.: v. also Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. i. p. 68.

3 V. the complete proof of this in Ideler, l. c. p. 487, ff.

whatever in the text, unless we call to our aid the purely airy hypothesis, that the author here gives a true description of the year, which, however, is immediately after destroyed by the admonition that we are "not to lay stress on the poetical exaggeration," and therefore not to expect any true description of the year. But, besides, with all this there is no proof given that the Hebrews, during the time of the Exile, adopted all at once a different mode of reckoning the year, from that which was in use at an earlier period; a view that is at least very much opposed by the old method of reckoning being found in the first book of the Maccabees; and it is not improbable that in the period before the exile as well, and even in the Mosaic age, the autumnal equinox was considered, if not as the commencement of the year, yet as an important division of the year.[1] The evidence of fact, at any rate, extends only to the change of the *names* of the months as having taken place in the Exile, but in other respects the continuance of the ancient calendar is probable on more grounds than one. 5. An especial confirmation of these Hebrew accounts is supplied by those traditions of antiquity concerning a flood, that are everywhere to be found. Considered in itself, it would be strange if these tales did not arise out of a common tradition, but, as has even recently been represented as very probable, had come to the Hebrews from an external source. For what interest could they well have had in taking up tales of that kind? Certainly their climate could not have led them to do it, since Palestine, as is well known, does not suffer from inundations. Besides, this view, that the tale of the flood had its origin in the peculiarities of climate, proves an utter failure in this very case with respect to the Egyptians, who speak of their own land as having been spared by the flood, while the whole of Atlantis perished by it (Diod. Sic. i. 10),—a striking proof of the accommodation of the universal tradition. Everywhere do we thus find the fundamental elements of history agreeing surprisingly as before in single circumstances with the Bible-history, only with a diversified national colouring. The subject has been thus worked into many different forms in Indian tradition; but in its *simplest* form (in the Epic Mahabharata) appears so much affected by mythical additions and conformity to poetic interest, that it pre-supposes an original history

1 See Ideler, l. c. p. 493, ff.

of a simpler character, our entire ignorance of which certainly does not justify the conclusion, that "the conception has sprung up in so pure a form on the soil of India, that it may be firmly denied that any external influence has operated on it" (Von Bohlen, p. 81); though certainly the *ideal* side of the mythus can be attributed to no other source. The same tale meets us in a purer and more historical form among the Chaldæans, according to the information supplied by Berosus and Abydenus. But here, also, abstracting the pure mythological colouring, there occur such important points of agreement, that we see that in the mouth of this primitive people, —for such Scripture also recognises them to be—the tradition had been more faithfully preserved, and a greater importance had been ascribed to the subject itself than was elsewhere the case, as the feast celebrated in reference to it shows.[1] The characteristic agreement consists in the statement of the proposal of Cronos to Sisuthros to build a ship, the landing of the latter in Armenia, and the sending out of the birds.[2] In this it is worthy of remark, that with reference to the end of Sisuthros, of whom it is said that he and his family were taken up to the gods because of their piety, and thus suddenly disappeared[3]—we have a new and splendid testimony to the original character of our history: that mythical glorification could find a place only where the tradition of primitive times had already become dark and confused. That traditions of the deluge were maintained in anterior Asia, is proved not so much by the coins of Apamea, which indeed are of very late origin,[4] as by the Grecian tales whose origin is to be traced to that quarter. The peculiar family traditions of Ogyges and Deucalion are proofs (v. Buttmann upon them, p. 194, ff., 205, ff.), how early this tale was taken up by that mythology, which however at the same time localized it also most of all, and, according to the Hellenic fashion, interwove it with Grecian genealogies.[5] Thus we have no need to adduce any American or other cognate traditions, since these testi-

1 V. Münter, Relig. d. Babyl. p 67.

2 Comp. Münter, l. c. p. 119, ff.

3 In which case Buttmann, Mythol. p. 191, is incorrect in asserting that there is an interchange with the end of Enoch (Annakos); for that mode of expression is the prevalent one concerning the mythical glorification of heroes, so that we find just the same said of Belus, Nebuchadnezzar, &c.

4 Comp. Buttmann, Mythol. i. p. 192, ff. Pustkuchen, Urgesch. p. 273, ff.

5 Comp. Heyne, obss. ad Apollod. p. 38, sq. O. Müller, Prolegg. p. 179, ff.

monies sufficiently prove that they collectively suppose a common fact, and that, with respect to the credibility and purity of the account, none can be at all compared with that of the Bible; yea, the more historical the form assumed by the non-biblical narrative, the closer does its relationship to the Biblical one appear.

We have a very clear proof of the exclusion of every mythological as well as poetic element from our narrative, in the passage ix. 12, ff., concerning the rainbow. It is simply Jehovah's sign of the covenant between himself and men. It is otherwise among the Greeks, where Iris is not only closely connected with the mythology,[1] but in Homer is on that account employed in poetical representation as a purely poetical figure. As in the Scriptures that symbol contains a purely ethical view, so in mythology it contains a physico-theogonical one; and hence it is quite incorrect to find the same fundamental view in the former (Von Bohlen, p. 99.)

But the attacks of later writers are principally directed against the "odious legend," the "production of Israelitish national hatred," in ix. 21—27.[2] It cannot, however, be denied that here again the associated historical circumstances are entirely accordant with historical research, as in the point of the early cultivation of the vine (comp. Link. l. c. p. 433.) Besides, the facts of the narrative admit of no denial; the actual execution of the curse denounced on Canaan cannot be denied. In him—such is the meaning of the history—is concentrated the execration pronounced upon Ham; the shameful conduct of the father of the race received its punishment from the living God principally in this family, which stood in most immediate contact with the covenant-people; even as the blessing given to Shem was concentrated in the covenant-people, so was the curse of Ham in Canaan. In this lies the high ethical significance of our narrative, in which, no more than anywhere else, does the objective sentence of rejection admit of separation from the subjective guilt (comp. Tholuck, on the Epistle to the Romans v. 16), the existence of which in the present case is strongly corroborated by history, showing that the sins of the Canaanites, eved before the theocratic punishment, brought down upon them extraordinary divine judgments. This mode of regarding it is certainly

1 V. Hesiodi Theog. 266, Apollod. i. 2.

2 V. De Wette, Beitr. p. 75, ff. Hartmann, p. 406. Von Bohlen, p. 103, ff.

superior, indeed diametrically opposed to that which reminds us only too much of the morality of the advocates of a carnal outward reformation, which is here applied as a standard to the Bible history by our opponents, as Von Bohlen here speaks not only of the "tasteless [mention of] intoxication," but also of an "insignificant transgression of Ham, committed against his will" (sic!). A morality, which from this point of view wantonly assails the Word of God, is the noblest testimony on behalf of Scripture, which does not gloss over sin, but inexorably denounces its woe, against all who transgress the law of the Holy One of Israel.

We have a clear proof how little reason there is to suspect the account as fictitious, in the circumstance that it is not Canaan, but Ham that commits the sin. Now an Israelite who was influenced by mere "national hatred," would hardly have made use of this apparent incongruity, (which was not first discovered by modern criticism, but was remarked at an early period, as some MSS. of the Septuagint, ix. 25, read instead of "*Canaan*," "*Ham*," as Saadias also does)—in the endeavour to give credibility to what was a pure "fiction;" for with the least trouble it might have been so contrived, that the incidents should have had another occasion assigned them. And as to the doubts that one has sought to cast in general on the Hamitic origin of the Canaanites, they rest on the error of making no distinction between relationship in language and national relationship.[1]

§ 17. CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE TABLE OF NATIONS.—GEN. X.

As this section contains very full geographical and ethnographical information, it is of the greatest importance carefully to follow these indications, since we shall thus best ascertain whether the historical testimonies compel us to conclude that the work belongs decidedly to a period subsequent to that of Moses, or not. This can be made out only by an historical examination of the separate parts. We previously remark, however, as two characteristics that distinguish this genealogy, the following points:—1. The list proposes to point out the origin of the different nations, giving special

1 Compare on this point the author's General Introduction to the O. T. (of which it is intended to publish a translation in this series), § 18.

reference and prominence to the Semitic branch, which is of chief importance here. The question then arises, whether all the proper names mentioned in this place by the author are to be considered as real progenitors, or as gentile nouns. The chapter itself supplies us with the correct view. The author's intention is to give "the generations, *i. e.*, families of the sons of Noah" (x. 5, 20, 31, 32,) which expression of itself leads us to suppose that the author meant to give not solely names belonging to individuals, but also collective designations. This is confirmed by the comparison of the plurals used by the writer (vers. 13, 14), as well as by the gentile designations (vers. 16—18.) Now when in these latter cases also יָלַד, *to beget* is used, it is clear that we are to seek in it only the general idea of *derivation*, with which also the usage of Scripture elsewhere in genealogical statements agrees (comp. 1 Chron. ii. 24, iv. 3, viii. 29; Michaelis, Spicil. Geogr. h. ext. i. p. 4, sq.) Thus it follows that there is a two-fold point of view to be taken in reference to these statements: in some names the author evidently has in his eye *persons* as progenitors (comp. especially ver. 8, ff.), in others, on the contrary, the *races*, the families of the nations themselves; and it is this also that is expressed in the statement of his intention, not only to give the sons born to the sons of Noah (ver. 1), but also to define them according to their families. This brings out an element that is of importance to the historical character of the genealogy. We see, namely, that the principle that obtains in it is by no means such as lies at the bottom, *e. g.*, of the later Greek genealogical traditions, which contain a genuine mythical mode of expression, the personification of the people, the city, &c., animated by the form attributed to them of human relationship to one another, such as marriage and parentage.[1] It is, therefore, with a total disregard of criticism that later critics have, in spite of this characteristic distinction, compared our table of descent with the "ethnographic mythology" of the Hellenes, in which the individual is epically introduced for the people.[2] 2. We have in this specification a genealogical tradition, preserved in the Hebrew nation, among whom it could be preserved in its purity, because that people continued more faithful than any other to their

[1] V. the excellent remarks in O. Müller's Prolegonema, p. 178, ff.

[2] *E. g.*, Winer, Reallex. i. p. 399. Gesenius in the Halle Encyc. on Ancient Bib. Geography. Von Bohlen, p. 111, &c.

original family-unity, and kept themselves free from commixture with other nations and races. The exact distinction and separation of each national branch from the other, is a mark unmistakeably impressed upon the table; and that is a truly theocratic standing-point. Compare with this the manner in which Hellenic tradition, treating history with freedom, brings foreign nations in its process of mythical fabrication into the circle of the legends of the Hellenic race, and groups together into one whole both what is Grecian and what is foreign.[1] In close connection with this stands another characteristic of the free mythical formation: its genealogies were subject to change from the same cause, in which they had their origin; far from meeting with unity in them, we find the most manifold diversity and disfigurement.[2] But here, on the contrary, we possess in the recapitulation of our genealogy in 1 Chron. i. a striking evidence of the opposite. In the time of the Chronicler nothing more was known from antiquity concerning the origin of nations than what Genesis supplied: supposing then that some inquiring mind composed this table of nations, from merely reflecting on the nations that happened to exist at the same period, and attempting to give them a systematic arrangement, how could it possibly happen that his turn of mind should be in such complete harmony with that of the other? This could arise only from the one recognizing the decided superiority of the other's account, which here lies in nothing else than the historical truth itself belonging to it. But in general also no ethnographic mythus has had its origin in the fictitious invention of an arbitrary division and arrangement of nations. Though Heyne indeed declared the Grecian genealogies to be simply "conatus origines populorum investigandi" (obss. ad Apollod. p. 105), and traced them to a "communis error hominum," such a view might be excused in that period when the study of mythology was still in its infancy; but its want of truth can no longer escape any really inquiring mythologist.[3] These parallels, therefore, should not have

[1] V. O. Müller, l. c. p. 182, ff.

[2] Comp. *e. g.* O. Müller, die Dorier i. p. 11. A similar cause led to falsifications in Homer. V. Wilh. Müller, Homer. Vorschule, p. 89, ff.

[3] "If we consider this belief, we shall also cease to regard the genealogies, which arose still in the age of the later Epic writers, and perhaps even of the Logographers, as being properly pure invention; these also must have arisen through gradual enlarge-

led to the denying our passage its claim to the certainty of original facts, since the possibility of their purer preservation lies in the peculiarity of the theocratic spirit. We must regard it as even still more strange, if we otherwise rightly understand the traditions of all other nations, looking only to these, that this chapter could be reckoned among the latest portions of the canon, and be looked upon as a production of the Exile (comp. Von Bohlen, p. 114). If inventions of such a kind are in general to be admitted, it is necessary above all to be able to point out the *occasion* and *purpose* of them, which always become apparent in such circumstances as the disfigurations, to which we have referred, of the Hellenic genealogies. The occasion of them has been considered to be the acquaintance which the Hebrews at that later epoch formed with other distant nations. Yet we certainly cannot see in what precise way this mere external acquaintance should have given occasion to such a genealogy; but even supposing this, why should the ante-Mosaic period stand contrasted in this respect with the later one? "Was it indeed—asks Eichhorn, iii. p. 88—not till after the time of Moses that the world became acquainted with itself?" Assuredly not! Let us only look into the history of Abraham which immediately follows, and we shall find the countries that lie far to the east coming in contact with anterior Asia (c. xiv.); while the patriarchs collectively stand in connection with Mesopotamia, Egypt, Arabia, and Phœnicia; and so forth—indeed looking to Genesis, it is just in that period that we should expect a much closer acquaintance, and one of a more extensive character, with foreign countries than at a later time; a circumstance which is founded entirely on the nature of the case, and has a close connection with the life and simple manners of antiquity. But perhaps the *purpose* of the chapter may be easier to discover. De Wette acted prudently in his "Beiträge" [*Contributions*], in not going into it at all; Hartmann, p. 244, and Von Bohlen, p. 113, express themselves more clearly upon it. According to them, it was the national pride of the Hebrews to trace their descent from Shem, Noah's first-born son, "that their rights might appear to have a superior foundation to those of other nations," that was the purpose

ment and inferences, that possessed in that age general evidence." O. Müller, Prolegg. p. 179.

of our author. But unfortunately there are not wanting among the Shemites either Assur or Elam; and when we try to imagine how the vain national prejudice of ancient hostility towards Assur and continued enmity with Elam, against which the Prophets of the Exile utter the most threatening oracles, should suddenly have become forgetful, and made them belong to the same family-stock as the Hebrews,—and this, be it observed, by a pure fiction!—we willingly confess that such an aimless purpose surpasses our comprehension, and may well be charged on the arbitrary procedure of our pseudo-critics, but certainly not on Scripture.[1]

To pass on now to details, we find the name of the patriarch of

1 In connection with this, however, it must be observed, that it is at least a disputed point, whether Shem or Japhet be the first-born, a matter which Von Bohlen indeed does not appear to have regarded as of importance to the enquiry. Viewed apart from prejudice, there is most to be said *in favour of* the primogeniture of Japhet, which would leave the hypothesis that we have contested but the smallest appearance of probability. For (1.), as relates to the order of sequence in which the sons of Noah usually stand in Genesis, it is evidently selected, as Ham's position shows, not according to the order of birth, but from the peculiar theocratic point of view; the old theologians called it *ordo gratiæ, non naturæ*, not quite properly. Thus it is explained (*a*) why Shem takes precedence, as the immediate holder of the divine promises; (*b*) why Ham follows next, whose posterity was most important to the Theocracy. That such a mode of position is the custom in Genesis is clear from such passages as xxxviii. 5, xlviii. 20. (2.) The chronology (comp. v. 32 with xi. 10) evidently speaks against the primogeniture of Shem, and on account of the latter passage it is a subterfuge that cannot be allowed, to suppose that the definition of the time when Noah began to beget children is an indefinite statement adopted for the sake of a round number (see particularly Schelling in Repert. f. bibl. u. M. Lit. xvii. p. 20, ff.). The year in which Noah began to have children is no more a round, indefinite number, than the statements concerning the irruption of the Deluge that follow immediately after, where the statements of time are so exact as to make such a supposition impossible. (3.) The passage Gen. x. 21, rightly understood, favours only our opinion. The words אחי יפת הגדול may certainly be translated, "Japhet's eldest brother" (comp *e. g.* Jud. i. 13, ix. 5), but they may be taken grammatically just as well, "the brother of Japhet, the eldest;" comp. Ewald, Gr. § 496, 2te Ausg. The context, consequently, must decide the point. Now, the pre-eminence given to Shem—this is a circumstance often overlooked—does not lie in those words, but in these: "the father of all the sons of Eber," in which a reference is made to ch. ix. (*quemadmodum, ad infamandum Chamum, supra eum vocaverat* PATREM CANAANIS, *a Noa maledicti, ita Semum nunc dicit patrem omnium filiorum Heber sive Hebræorum, ad eum nobilitandum.* Rosenmüller, p. 225); consequently it lies in the promise that was made to him, not in his natural rights. We have here, therefore, the actual fulfilment of that declaration pointed out. But to Japhet also a salvation, though an inferior one, was announced (v. Hengstenberg, Christol. i. 1, p. 47, ff.), and it is only the reference to ix. 27 that explains why Japhet is here mentioned in connection with Shem. This passage then appears to be a closer confirmation by facts of the prophecy; Japhet is the first-born, and obtains accordingly a numerous posterity, extensive districts of country, and his blessing bears precisely the same relation to Shem's as that of Esau does to Jacob's, xxv. 23.

the first class of nations occurring again in the mythology of a Japhetic people. It is the name *Ιαπετος*, the explanation of which is hardly to be found in Greek,[1] but is found in Hebrew in the record itself, in an easy and natural manner, which refutes the supposition that our author had the foreign name in his thoughts (Von Bohlen, p. 113). Whatever confusion has been introduced into the mythus of the Titans by the different editions it has gone through, and the various elements with which it has become intermixed, yet we can plainly discern, in all the allegorical and mythologico-hellenic constituents of it, that it possesses an ethnographic value. This is clear from the connection of Iapetus with Deucalion and Hellen; with regard to which it must also not be overlooked, that in the most ancient poetry a simpler form of the mythus is as unquestionably presented,[2] as the later form bears express evidence of a foreign influence being exercised on the farther (dogmatico-physical) development of it.[3] The circumstance, also, that in a form of the tradition preserved by Apollodorus, *Asia* is the consort of Iapetos (comp. Heyne obss. p. 10), might serve as an additional proof, that this connection effected by Iapetos had not disappeared from the recollection of the people; at least it confirms the ancient ethnographic character of the mythus.

Among the Japhetites (x. 2—5), the *Cimmerians* (גֹּמֶר) are first distinguished as an original people, and as such they were regarded by the Greeks, as is shown by the mention of them in Homer (Odyss. xi. 14, ff.), but principally in Herod iv. 11: *τὴν γὰρ νῦν* (sc. *γῆν*) *νέμονται Σκύθαι, ἄυτη λέγεται τὸ παλαιὸν εἶναι Κιμμερίων*; as in iv. 12 also he makes mention of the Cimmerian monuments still remaining among the Scythians. Beside Gomer stands *Magog*, the mention of whom is the more important, because of the comparison of Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix. Here we have a very striking exhibition of the difference between the time of the composition of this piece, and the time of Ezekiel's, however much some may be inclined, because of the recurrence of the names, to regard both as contemporary (Von Bohlen, p. 114). Here, observe, the name

1 The notion that *Ἰαπετός* is connected with *Javo*, and *Jovis* (Buttmann Mythol. i. p. 224) is certainly incorrect, and highly artificial.

2 Comp. particularly Hom. Il. viii. 478, ff. with the Theogony of Hesiod; see O. Müller, Prolegg. p. 374, ff.

3 Comp. especially Diod. Sic. i. 97 (comp. Pausanias viii. 37).

Magog still appears as that of a real national race, as the ancient name of a distant Asiatic class of nations: in Ezekiel, on the contrary, it represents a purely *ideal* people, the symbol and substratum of the violent power of the heathen nations in their conflict with the kingdom of God (comp. Zech. xiv.; Revel. xx. 8, 9; Hengstenberg, Christol. ii. p. 347, ff.) That Ezekiel thus employs the name of Magog is plain: 1. From the article (הַמָּגוֹג xxxviii. 2), by which the name is treated rather as an appellative than as a proper name: see Ewald, Krit. Gram. p. 568, ff. 2. From the king's name, formed in analogy with the name Magog (with the מ *loci*), *Gog*, the prince of Magog; on which the Apocalypse makes an additional change, by treating Gog and Magog as two nations (ἔθνη), comp. Ewald, ad Apoc. p. 304. Now as the Apocalypse here presupposes the passage in Ezekiel, so with like necessity does Ezekiel that in Genesis: the ideal treatment of the subject by that prophet supposes a real, historical foundation, which can be found nowhere else than in Genesis.—*Madai* is the ancestor of the Medes. It is singular that in this simple notice a proof has been discovered of the late composition of the piece. The name Madian, says V. Bohlen, p. 117, signifies *middle, madhya*, since, as Polybius 5, 44 remarks, *in their opinion*, their position is περὶ μέσην τὴν Ἀσίαν. It is farther the opinion of the same learned man, that the nation must have first assumed this name, after it took through Dejoces (B. C. 710) an independent position in the history of the world. But Polybius makes that remark as to the situation of Media entirely from his own judgment: ἡ γὰρ Μήδεια κεῖται μὲν περὶ μέσην τὴν Ἀσίαν—so that it was a name founded on the *geographical* situation of the country, of which alone that writer is speaking, and not at all on its historical importance.[1] But there are so many historical testimonies to be shown in favour of the very early existence of the Zend nation as an independent people, which is the point here in question, especially after the recent investigations concerning the Zend-avesta (comp. also Diod. Sic. ii. 1), that no doubt can prevail respecting it. It is here, however, particularly worthy of notice, that nothing is said of the

[1] Yet certainly the other primitive name of this people was *Ceri* Ἄριοι (Herod. vii. 62, 66), which, according to V. Bohlen (de orig. ling. Zend. p. 51, d. a. Indien i. p. 47), signifies the *honourable, distinguished*; which thus, much more than the other, possessed historical importance, and is yet indisputably older than the period of Dejoces.

subsequent division of this stock, which could not be unknown to a writer of the time of the Exile, who was so well informed as ours (comp. Herod. i. 101); so that the Zend people here appears in its primitive unity, to which we are led also by the ancient native accounts of the Vendidad.—It is certainly as deserving of consideration, that among the following names, *Meshech*, *Tubal*, *Tiras*, the stock connected with them in Ezekiel, *Rosh*, is wanting; while on the other hand, Tiras is mentioned nowhere else in Scripture,[1] —a striking confirmation of the proper independence of this section.

As relates to the mention of *Javan* and the nations descended from him (x. 4), it has long been remarked (v. Rosenmüller, scholl. p. 197) what an exact agreement with this we find in the statement of Herodotus concerning the Ionians and Dorians, the descendants of Hellen (i. 56, ff.). In this, the circumstance that Tarshish is here represented as proceeding from Javan, is of especial importance. Let us consider, namely, how this place had the closest mercantile connection with the Phœnicians as early as the age of David and Solomon, so that the error, shared by so many Greek authors, of considering Tartessus as a Phœnician colony, was certainly a natural one. But it is the original inhabitants of Tarshish that are here intended (בת תרשיש, Is. xxiii. 10), who lived in an oppressed condition under Phœnician tyranny (v. Gesenius on Is. i. p. 733, ff.). Indeed, in reference to their descent from Javan, there appears to have been preserved among the notices of Herodotus no indistinct trace of it, since he narrates of the Phocæans, who in the time of Cyrus sailed to Tartessus, that they had formed a friendly relation of the most intimate kind with the inhabitants of that country,[2]—a circumstance which leads us to suppose that there was an original relationship between the stocks. A similar remark holds good of the *Kittim* who are joined with Tarshish,—the Cyprians, who before the age of Solomon were already subject to the Phœnicians (v. Hengstenberg, de reb. Tyr. p. 55), having indeed been violently subjugated (comp. also Is. xxiii. 12). Their Grecian descent is testified also by Herod. vii. 90, according

1 To combine that name with *Thrace*, which has been the common practice since Bochart, appears to me attended with violence. I should suggest the name *Tyras*, known to the ancients as the name of a river, a city, and nations among the Scythian national stocks. V. Herod. iv. 11, 52. Plin. hist. nat. iv. 26. Pomp. Mela. ii. 1, 74.

2 V. i. 163. King Arganthonius invited them *ἐκλιπόντας Ἰωνίην——τῆς ἑωυτοῦ χώρης οἰκῆσαι ὅκου βούλονται.*

to declarations of the Cyprians themselves, comp. Diog. Laert. vit. *Zenon* init., who speaks of Citium as πολίσματος ἑλληνικοῦ, φοινικὰς εποίκους εσχηκότος. The introduction of the *Dodanim* (which appears to be the correct reading), leads us again to one of the oldest seats of Grecian civilization; Dodona, where a sacred race of priests had settled in primeval times (Strabo, vii. p. 328, sq. p. 506), which was afterwards obliged to yield to foreign (Pelasgic) influence;[1] and in that case we should here evidently have the most ancient notice of that primitive Hellenic settlement.

While, turning to the descendants of Ham, whose name likewise appears to have been preserved among his posterity (v. Buttmann, i. p. 224, ff.), we pass over the Cushite nations, x. 7, that never appear again in Scripture in this manner and extent—which sufficiently proves the primitive antiquity of the information; the connection of Cush with Babylon, stated in ver. 8, ff., through the descent of Nimrod from the former, is the more important for our purpose. Now, a remarkable confirmation of this statement is found in foreign authors. In the first place, the origin of Babel itself is traced back into the remoteness of a dim antiquity. The one opinion respecting it was that which was spread by Ctesias among the ancients (v. Ctes. p. 397, ed. Bähr.): that Semiramis built the city. This is sufficiently explained by the particular pains which this author takes to do honour to Semiramis. This was the easier to do, since, according to Herodotus, it was many kings of Babylon οἱ τὰ τείχεά τε επεκόσμησαν καὶ τὰ ἱρά (i. 184). On the contrary, the native tradition of the Babylonians ascribes the foundation of the city to *Belus*, and Berosus expressly opposes the opinion of the Ἑλληνικοὶ συγγραφεῖς, that Semiramis was the builder of the city (in Jos. con. Ap. i. § 19); and with him Abydenus in Euseb. præp. evan. ix. 41, agrees, according to whom Belus surrounded the city with a wall. This information, more credible in itself, as being native, commended itself also to learned historians of antiquity,[2] and is confirmed by the closer consideration of the my-

1 It is at least, in any case, of importance that Herod. ii. 52, ff., mentions sacred *women*, but Strabo *men*, as being in possession of this oracle. Comp. Kreuser, Vorfr. üb. Homeros i. p. 267, ff.

2 Comp. Curtius v. 1: Semiramis eam (Babylonem) condiderat, vel, *ut plerique credidere*, Belus, cujus regia ostenditur."—Ammian. Marcell. xxiii. 6: "Babylon, cujus mœnia bitumine Semirâmis struxit: *arcem enim antiquissimus rex condidit Belus.*" See other passages in Bochart, Can. p. 263.

thus of Belus itself. Hero-worship was certainly indigenous in Babylon, as has been well pointed out by Münter (p. 29, ff.); and that Belus was such a hero we are made certain, by the grave of Belus being in the temple of Belus.[1] The native tradition expressly recognized him as such; in Abydenus, l. c. Nebuchadnezzar says: ὁ Βῆλος ὁ ἐμὸς πρόγονος ἥτε βασίλεια Βῆλτις.[2]—Even antiquity, however, assigned this Bel an *Egyptian* descent. Diodorus Siculus relates that Belus, the son of Poseidon and Libya, led colonists to Babylon, and that the Chaldeans were descendants of the Egyptians (i. 28, 81). This account, or old tradition, is confirmed by ancient authors. Pausanias also, iv. 23, 5, says: ὁ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι Βῆλος, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς Αἰγυπτίου Βήλου τοῦ Λίβυος ὄνομα ἔσχεν; and Hestiæus, in Joseph. Ant. i. 6, considers the Babylonians at least to have been colonists, who immigrated with the shrines of Ζεὺς Ἐννάλιος. Now the mythology of Babylon, which stands in striking harmony with the Egyptian, and its worship also throughout, agree with this.[3] In this it is also worthy of remark, that the last-named author speaks of a Ζεὺς (*i. e.* Belus) Ἐννάλιος, which leads us to view him as the God of War (comp. Selden de diis Syris, p. 213, Creuzer, Symb. ii. p. 610), and again confirms our earlier conclusion that Belus was a deified hero. Then the analogy between Nimrod and Belus is the more striking—confirmed also by the astronomical part of the mythus, according to which Nimrod is Orion (Hitzig on Is. p. 159)—especially when we see, that both names are properly only appellatives, inasmuch as Nimrod

[1] Comp. Görres, Mythengesch. p. 269, ff. Münter, p. 19, ff.

[2] Comp. Servius ad Virg. Æn. i. 73. "Primus Assyriorum regnavit Saturnus, quem Assyrii Deum nominavere Saturnum." Ad Æn. i. 646: "Apud Assyrios Bel dicitur quâdam sacrorum ratione et Saturnus et Sol."

[3] Comp. *my* Comment. on the Book of Daniel, p. 45, ff., 144. ff. With this result Leo also (Lehrb. d. Univ. Gesch. i. p. 105, ff.) agrees. That which Von Lengerke on Dan. p. 44, referring to Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. i. p. 198, ff., observes to the contrary, is very weak. The testimony of Josephus, Antiq. i. 8, receives its explanation from a combination of the history of Abraham with the tale (adopted among the Greeks) that astronomy had come to Egypt from Babylon—a supposition which, moreover, as this fact belongs to the most remote antiquity, remains still a *possible* one, and by no means contradicts that other tradition. Besides, I think it can easily be shewn that it was only a partial Grecian mythical view, that gave the foreign tradition a new form in that respect. This plainly appears from Apollodorus ii. 1—4, who says that only Agenor emigrated (see further on this in seq.), but Belus remained in Egypt; which plainly proves that the other foreign tradition, of the derivation of the Babylonian Bel from Egypt, had reached the ears of the Greek Mythographers, who, however, did not regard it as probable and agreeable, and accordingly gave it that modification.

can hardly be made to signify *the rebel*, but should be taken in the wider sense of *ruler*, *sole ruler* (*τύραννος*).[1]

The historical truth of our information concerning the beginning of Babel is thus strikingly confirmed, and we may pass over the conjecture of Von Bohlen (p. 126, ff.), which has no foundation, that, by Nimrod, Merodach Baladan is intended, the rashness of which is hardly equalled by any other hypothesis; the more, as it is supported by explanations, such as that Cush means Upper Asia, which are alone sufficient for its entire rejection with thorough historians.

The account of the beginnings of the Assyrian kingdom is equally verified. Assur is a Semite (x. 22), but goes forth from Babel (Sinear) x. 11, and founds the capital city Resen, and the cities Nineveh, Rechoboth, Ir, and Calach. All the accounts we have from other quarters reach only to that form of the Assyrian kingdom, when Nineveh is its chief city, and the extra-Biblical traditions relate to it and its foundation by Ninus. "Who does not here recognize the man (says Eichhorn, l. c. p. 89) who wrote before Nineveh had yet reached that greatness, which we find it possessing in Jonah and among the Greeks? Another writer, some centuries later, would have made Nineveh, which was so amazingly great in the last centuries of the Assyrian monarchy, the greatest city." In addition to this, express testimonies, though they are those of later chronologers, make Ninus the son of Belus.[2] The tribes of Mizraim, introduced in ver. 13, 14, are almost all entirely unknown to us, as even Josephus has said (Ant. i. 6): *περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐδὲν ἴσμεν.* But from the mention of *Pathros*, the nomos of Thebais (v. Is. xi. 11, and expositors ad loc.), it is probable that the author here, as below, in the case of Canaan, intended to give the various primitive Egyptian states. Josephus has remarked that their memory was destroyed in the Ethiopic war. This view agrees very well also with later inquiries, which have made it certain that Egypt, in the earliest period, consisted of a number of single independent states; in connection with which it deserves attention, that the number given in the accounts we have from Manetho, of *five* old contemporary dynasties, nearly agrees with

1 So that the name finds its closer explanation in the following גְּבוֹר and צַיִד. Comp. the Arabic and Syriac usus loquendi in Michaelis, Spicil. i. p. 212.

2 See Beck, Weltgesch. i. p. 194.

the number of the *six* tribes mentioned in our record.[1] According to this, we also regard the Casluchim, ver. 14, not as Bochart does, as Colchians, into which land Egyptian colonists may certainly have been led (but, as it seems, not at least till a later period[2]), but likewise as an ancient Egyptian nomos. This is the more necessary, since the Philistines are derived from them as colonists, whose name (LXX. ἀλλόφυλοι) marks them as immigrants. Along with the Philistines the Caphtorim also are named as an Egyptian colony. By *Caphtor* recent writers have rightly understood *Crete*. For (1), from its geographical position, and according to history, Crete was one of the most ancient places of connection between Egypt and the East: v. Creuzer, Symb. iv. p. 13, ff. (2.) Traces of the name also have been preserved on the island; in the temple which Strabo calls ὁ Πτέριος (ix. p. 644), according to Pausanias, from a Delphian colonist (ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῷ Πτερᾶν εἶναι), from which the inhabitants of the city Aptera took the name Ἀπτεραῖοι (x. 5, 5), comp. Plin. H. N. iv. 20. Add to this (3) the expressions of Scripture, that the Philistines were descended from Caphtor; but from this very descent the Philistines have the appellation of Cretans, and, according to the well-grounded investigations of Lackemacher,[3] there is no doubt that the later names Krethi and Plethi refer to two different tribes of Philistæa. With this the statement in Deut. ii. 23 agrees well, that the Philistines had received a colony from Caphtor, by whom the nomadic Avites, who belonged to the older Philistine stock (comp. Josh. xiii. 3), were driven out and destroyed. This notice consequently has a complete historic foundation, as in the age of David we meet with both the national stocks, which again throws light also upon Genesis, inasmuch as the latter knows only of the ancient Egyptian origin of the people, and mentions the perhaps contemporary colony in Crete, which at a later time, but still in the Mosaic age, sent out colonies to the continent; where again we find an exact agreement with the notices of the ancients, who refer the maritime dominion of the Cretans to the mythical period of Minos, to whom also they

[1] Comp. Heeren. Ideen ii. 2, p. 103, ff., 4te Ausg.

[2] Comp. Herodot. ii. 104, and Perizonius upon it, Origg. Ægypt. p. 337, sq. Heeren, l. c. i. 1, p. 405, ff. Ritter, Vorhalle Europ. Völkersch. p. 36, ff.

[3] Observv. philolog. ii. p. 11—44, comp. Ewald, Krit. Gr. p. 297.

ascribe the foundation of colonies,[1] even calling Gaza the city of Minos.[2]

However much some may be inclined at present to question the Hamitic origin of the Canaanites,[3] as a purely individual view of the Hebrew narrator; yet it has in its favour no despicable amount of external testimony. The Grecian mythical tradition gives as the brother of Belus, the ancestor of Babel, Agenor, son of Poseidon and Libya; and this king of Phœnicia, to whom the name Χνᾶ (Canaan) is also expressly given,[4] is accordingly referred to a common origin with Babylon, Egypt, and Phœnicia.[5] But the following is still more important in reference to the national tribes of Canaan: (1.) The mention of Sidon, and the omission of Tyre. Sidon is also mentioned again in Genesis xlix. 13; Tyre; on the contrary, first occurs in the book of Joshua (xix. 29), and this latter notice receives historical confirmation from a multitude of testimonies (Hengstenb. de reb. Tyr. p. 6, 7.). But it is also plain, at the same time, from the book of Joshua, as well as from that of Judges, that Sidon at that time was the more considerable and therefore certainly also the older city, which is confirmed by its honourable designation רַבָּה in Joshua, and other notices (v. Hitzig on Is. p. 286; Schlosser, Universalhist. Uebers. i. p. 201); while in later authors Tyre, having cast Sidon into the shade by its splendour, is always named first—Tyre and Sidon (de Vignolles, Chronol. de l'hist. s. ii. p. 17, sq.). It may therefore safely be supposed that the foundation of Tyre was subsequent to that of Sidon, though still in the ante-Mosaic period, which shows that our information goes back to the most ancient times. (2.) Importance also attaches to the original ancient definition of the boundaries of the Canaanites, ver. 19: "as far as Sodom, Gomorrha, Admah and Zeboim unto Lasha,"[6] which leads us to a period when all these cities were

1 Comp. Hoeck, Creta ii. p. 201, sq.

2 V. Stephanus Byz. s. v. γάζα.

3 V. *e. g.* Winer Reallex. i. p. 244. Von Bohlen, p. 133.

4 V. Buttmann Mythol. i. p. 233.

5 Comp. Apollodor. ii. 1, 4 (where it is said: Ἀγήνωρ μὲν οὖν εἰς φοινίκην ἀπαλλαγεὶς ἐβασίλευσε, κἀκεῖ τῆς μεγάλης ῥίζης ἐγένετο γενεάρχης) v. Heyne obss. p. 212, also Curtius iv. 4: utramque urbem (Tyre and Sidon) Agenorem condidisse credebant.

6 לַיִשׁ is unquestionably the most ancient name of Dan, the northernmost border-city of

still standing, the last of which appears nowhere else, not even in the Pentateuch again. Hence this notice admits of explanation, only on the admission that this section belongs to a primitive period, since the supposition that its name may have been preserved by tradition, has no sufficient support here, as later authors, while they certainly mention those first four cities, yet do it in such a way, that it is plain they have everywhere in their eye the account in the Pentateuch concerning their destruction.

Thus there are found in the present section the clearest traces of a primitive history recorded by Moses, which must by no means be ascribed to his own invention, but as to its origin must belong to a far earlier period.

§ 18. THE HISTORY OF THE PATRIARCHS.—GEN. XI.—XVI.

While, in defence of the historical truth of Gen. xi. 1—9, we refer to what has been said in the General Introduction to the Old Testament, § 26, we pass on to the genealogy in xi. 10, ff., which introduces the history of Abraham. In spite of its plain and simple character, it also has been charged with showing traces of fiction. These are discovered, first, in its "intentional symmetry," since like the earlier genealogy in ch. v., it consists of ten members, and, as that ended with the three sons of Noah, so this concludes with the three sons of Terah. This shows the epic character of the account (De Wette, p. 48 and 69; Schumann, p. 208; Von Bohlen, p. 154.). There is certainly nothing stranger than this mode of employing a genealogy as epic poetry. Of its rhythmical style, which Schumann here recognizes, we must confess we cannot discover the faintest traces; but we do admit that such a peculiar formal treatment may indicate the poetic character of a composition. For what purpose, then, could the free imagination of the writer have had recourse to this symmetry? No *end* indeed can be seen, for which he should in both cases employ the number *ten*. Still less what could occasion him to make the two genealogies equal?

Palestine, not Callirrhoe, as Hieron. will have it (see also Von Raumer, Paläst. p. 21.). In Joshua its name is לֶשֶׁם (xix. 47), commonly לַיִשׁ. So in our record, ver. 11, 12, כָּלְחֹ is still found for the later חלח, 2 Kings xvii. 6; in ver. 10 כַּלְנֵה, which was afterwards contracted into כַּנֵּה, Ezek. xxvii. 23.

This is the point which our opponents' criticism cannot explain, though they are evidently bound to show the reason of that symmetry, affording a discovery of the "intention," which is attributed to the "studied symmetry." The mere indication of the symmetry itself does not authorize the conclusions that have been deduced from it. But is this symmetry indeed of the kind that is supposed? Terah certainly has three sons as well as Noah, but Terah is the ninth member of the genealogy, Noah, on the contrary, the tenth. And what analogy can be pointed out between the sons of Noah, and those of Terah? This remark is sufficient to destroy the symmetrical character of those genealogies, and to show it to be merely illusory, an arbitrary construction of the critics, forced upon the text without reason.

Hartmann proceeds differently (p. 244.). According to him, "the national pride wished to know, what place among the descendants of Shem belonged to the ancestor of the Israelites, a people consecrated to God." To us that wish appears quite natural in every one who regards the person of Abraham as important, dear, and honoured, and therefore in every *Christian*. But is there indeed no other reason for it than impure pharisaical pride? Hear, however, a little more. "But here also *ignorance* could subjoin nothing more to the *fabricated* names than such arbitrary statements as are in ch. v." Singular logic! Why is the "national pride" so "ignorant?" It may, however, be said, with equal justice, that it preserves what it has received with remarkable fidelity. The invention of names, *lying*, is certainly what a sinful national pride can do. But if it is so devoid of shame as to invent the *names*, why can it not, in addition to the names, invent also *a history*? Truly bare names are a very poor gratification to empty vanity, when they are not accompanied by that which flatters it most. These names are just a proof how far the author was from giving *more* than he *knew*, and consequently prove on his part the *opposite* of *ignorance* as well as of *prejudice*.

But still an appeal is made to the peculiarity of the names adduced. They are full of meaning, it is said; from them alone a whole history might be composed.[1] We are by no means disposed

[1] This is attempted particularly by Von Bohlen, p. 155: "Shem lives in *Arapachitis* till an *emigration* (שלח) occurs; from the ancestors of the *Hebrews* (עבר) proceeds a *division* (פלג): *Rhages* (רעו) is peopled: from it farther down comes *Serug* (שרוג), and after some *tarrying* (הרח) the city Charræ (חרן)" &c.

here to overlook the symbolic meaning of several names in this genealogy; such a one is expressly given in the case of *Peleg* x. 25; but does it follow from that, that in those names there is only fiction? Is a significant name, because it is such, to be regarded as a fictitious one? Now, on closer examination, we find two classes of names: the one, names which those persons have in common with localities; the other, names which refer to historical occurrences. In the case of the former, the name of the place is evidently the memorial, which is connected with that personal name; but how did the narrator happen to name these cities exactly in this order? How did it here occur to him to adduce the same as persons? Many as are the names of places contained in Genesis, we can fully perceive how far it is removed from making such interchanges in this matter. Gen. x. furnishes examples enough to show how distinctly it separates the one from the other. But the statements of numbers, which are so exact, would then have no meaning here at all, since they also must have been exposed to transposition in the history in the same way as the names. It is impossible, however, to see why those places should not be regarded as the traces of the men who founded or formerly inhabited them. That this really was the case is both a fact involved in the simplicity of those ancient times which are here spoken of, and is also expressly confirmed in the present instance in Charan, which is called, xxiv. 10 (עיר נחור), "the city of Nahor," since Nahor had dwelt there. Thus the local names here exactly demonstrate the truth of the narrative. But as relates to the other class of proper names, it is to be well considered, that in the East and in antiquity in general, the significance of the name was firmly retained, —it was constantly understood in its intimate reference to the person bearing it; hence arose its connection with important events of the time, with which the birth and life of a person coincided, as also a change of name with the altered relations of life.[2] It is therefore only a thing deeply founded in the custom of the age, that we here meet with, of which the whole of Genesis, yea all the historical books of the Old Testament give evidence; and were the

[1] "Semper usitatum id fuit, ut nomina a factis historicis formata imponantur pueris eodem tempore natis." Perizonius, Origg. Babyl. p. 388, sq. "Solebant Arabes viros principes ab aliquo nobili vel facto vel dicto insignire." Schultens, Monum. p. 12, coll. p. 14.

[2] See my Commentary on Daniel, p. 30, ff.

argument good that is thence deduced against the historical existence of the persons mentioned, we should have equal ground for doubt in the case of narratives such as 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22; indeed, by this kind of view, which is a most narrow-minded one, and proceeds from a merely modern standing-point, we are deprived of any historical knowledge in the whole of our department.

As relates to the history of the Patriarchs, it brings us into a peculiar series of historical narratives. The full detail with which they are given, places us in a condition to examine as closely as possible the historical character of the information: the manifold statements we have concerning the life and action of that period, give us so vivid a picture of it, that we are competent to estimate it in all its aspects. Everywhere we meet with that simple dignity that is worthy of patriarchal life, which is nowhere found again in the later periods of the history. Was it on the whole possible to give a life-like reproduction of such a picture in a later age, which was quite a stranger to that kind of life? If Plato marked the traces of Ionic life in Homer (de legg. iii. p. 680), we also may with perfect justice celebrate the patriarchal life in Genesis; but the description of that life, no more than the Homeric poems, betrays a later hand, belonging to a time when the historical remembrance of that period had vanished. Let us take such an age as that of David, when the literary spirit was in active exertion,—which, however, to most of our recent critics, must needs seem still too ancient for our history,—it ought not to be difficult to point out the difference in the mode of life which then prevailed from what appears here; and every literary production can be comprehended only as taken in connection with the life of the age to which it belongs. Now, every period of Israelitish history bears a character of its own so marked and definite,—as that of the Judges, of David and Solomon, of the subsequent kings, and of the Exile,—that we can nowhere find a point, where the analogy of the circumstances of the time permits us to affirm decisively that the Patriarchal history was written then, because there we find again the ancient patriarchal mind and the primitive mode of life.

But it is properly upon another principle that the claim of these documents to the possession of an historical character is to be rested. The Patriarchal history begins with miraculous divine acts. A divine covenant is made with Abraham, and connected with this

fact is a multitude of others, all equally miraculous, and comprehending not merely the present, but even, in the way of preparation, the farthest future. To this is first opposed the meagre view of those, who placing these facts in the rank of natural occurrences, leave them an historical foundation indeed, but fix that arbitrarily, and ascribe the representation of the fact to the embellishing genius of the composer. From this point of view they think they have vindicated the historical character of the persons here introduced. They represent the history of Abraham as that of a simple Bedouin chief, who, according to the way of thinking in his age, believed that he heard the voice of the Deity in all his most important determinations, and especially in dreams; who by the contemplation of nature was led to form the idea of one God, and regarded himself as being, in all the dependent circumstances of a nomadic life, constantly dependent on him, &c.[1] Closely connected with this view, though standing in very decided opposition to the former, is that which assigns this history only to the domain of *poetry;* the pious fancy of a poet created these forms and their actions, unconcerned about the truth of the same, only induced by a sense of religious need, from regard to the same need of his contemporaries. De Wette, who has supported this view with particular consistency and energy (p. 60, ff.), may at the same time show in our behalf, how very much the fundamental view in both hypotheses is the same: "*Was it possible that God*—says he—could speak with Abraham, make a covenant with him, give him another name, and promise him the possession of the land of Canaan?"—"It is almost (?) inconceivable that Abraham should have had such ideas and hopes." He then accounts it to be "almost ridiculous," that we should really attribute to Abraham such "fanatical hopes, by which he must have made himself a subject of ridicule to all."

We must in the first place charge this mode of criticism with the reproach of forming decisions in a dogmatical and arbitrary manner, and resting on dogmatical suppositions; but this charge does not expose all that is involved in it, or represent its complete worthlessness. For it manifestly has a still more extensive meaning, which is connected indeed with that first supposition; we mean an *historical* meaning. With regard to the view which laboriously

1 Comp. *e. g.* Eichhorn Bibl. i. p. 41, ff. Bauer. Gesch. d. hebr. Nation, 106, ff., and even Winer himself, Reallex. i. p. 14.

endeavours to put a natural construction on the history of the Patriarchs, imposing upon it its own conceptions and its own mode of life, as well as that which with æsthetic feeling sees in it a poetic picture; there lies at the bottom of both a certain historical view, which is the same in the one as in the other, only in the latter case it is more concealed; so that the harsh strictures made by De Wette on the arbitrary treatment of Scripture on the part of historianizing (*historisirend*) expositors, may again be exactly applied to his own procedure. (1.) In both cases alike, that which is invented is placed at the commencement of Israelitish history in opposition to that which is given: in the one instance, by going to work positively; in the other by risking the assertion that, at the least, that age could *not* have been such as it is represented. In reference to our object, therefore, they are quite identical. On such a view the opinion is positively and decidedly maintained, that the life and action of that age must be quite in accordance with the common daily course of things. The peculiar character of each period is thus shamefully denied recognition; and while it is the first requisite of an historian to enter into this peculiarity, and vividly to reproduce it in himself, in the present instance it is entirely left out of view. Besides, the reasoning of our opponents necessarily brings us to this issue; since a certain period has a peculiar character of its own, it cannot be comprehended from the more general historical point of view, and therefore it either was such as it is described, or we know nothing concerning it. And thus we should be cheated out of modern history in general, as well as that which is ancient and most ancient. (2.) Should the truth of the Patriarchal history in the Bible be disputed, it could be done only by means of *analogy*. It could only be in case that we were in a condition to supply in that way something definite, that criticism would possess a safe, because an historical, foundation; since it would then only require to point out the credibility of the one account in comparison with the other, to come forward as the opponent of *our* representation. But such an analogy is entirely wanting. This account must consequently be confined to itself as its own criterion, and only what is founded *in itself* can serve as evidence of its unhistorical character, not that which is external to it, lying at a far distance from it, which furnishes no suitable standard. (3.) But this want of analogies might seem to tend to the disadvantage of the

defence of the strict historical apprehension also. The question accordingly is asked, how may it be shown that the *general standing-point* of the Patriarchal history, as fixed by itself, is one historically true? The answer lies in the peculiarity of this history as *preparatory to the theocratical institution.* This idea contains the subjective side of the belief, as well as the objective side of the self-testification or self-manifestation, of God as a living God; both of which, when taken in their concrete unity, constitute the idea of the *covenant,* as our history bears actual witness of it. If it is regarded from this point of view, the whole of its wonderfully peculiar character follows as a necessary consequence. Even as the Theocracy itself had nothing analogous to it in the history of mankind, but finds a higher confirmation of its truth in this very uniqueness that belongs to it, so is it with this its anticipation or preparation. But as this preparation is not to be conceived of as having merely a negative character—as a state of things left to take its own course, which would sink it into the category of the heathen element of life (*παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς*, Rom. i. 24), so that it would cease to be an integral part of the theocratic institution,—but only as having a positive character; the more peculiar must be our conception of the effect upon the individual mind of the objective manifestation of God, since both here occupy a position which is as incapable of recurring at a later period, as it is essentially presupposed. Consequently the Theocracy affords a retrospective confirmation of the historical phenomenon of the Patriarchal history, just as the Theocracy again is presupposed by Christianity; and in this way not only may the fundamental character of that history be understood, but it may be shown to be one arising from internal *necessity.*

If we take the narrative accordingly as furnishing a faithful account, we shall understand how to estimate the acts of God, as well as the subjective character of those who were called to be the holders of that revelation. The procedure of both in that case becomes plain to us: whatever unfaithfulness may be chargeable on the latter, the name of Jehovah still remains ever holy and glorious, while in all their fidelity and righteousness, it is he again who makes such excellencies possible, by his making himself known to them. But if, on the other hand, we imagine an author who freely embellishes his subject, and who merely invents it, led by æsthetic

feeling; it was impossible that he could relate things in *such* a way. Or what then prevented him from relating the history of Jacob in a manner analogous to Abraham's? Why did he not then represent him, the Patriarch of the twelve tribes of Israel, as the first-born, if all he had to do was to maintain the honour of his nation in that matter? Why then are the spots in Abraham's history no more concealed from us than the gross sins of the sons of Jacob, among whom even Levi forms no exception? Or, in general, how can this be well reconciled, that from the same author, who is so much blamed in Jacob's history because of the moral view on which it is based, there should proceed the picture of complete moral greatness that we have in the history of Abraham? Can it indeed have occurred to his mind, to excite that interest in his readers at which he aimed, by assuming this purely natural position? Thus let this criticism, which presumes in so unhallowed a manner to censure the sacred history, consider how it succeeds with the merely human standard which it applies to it, heaping the unintelligible on the unintelligible so as to annihilate itself!

Let us now attempt to prove the historical character of this history in detail. The family of Abraham removes from Ur in Chaldæa, with the intention of going to Canaan, yet arrives only at Haran. It may easily be understood, how the nomadic family, leaving the high-lying northern parts of Mesopotamia, which were poorer in pastures, sought other places. In this it is worthy of remark, that Terah had the intention of going to Palestine (as in that primitive age the migrations of nations moved from east to west, see ch. xiv.): it is by no means concealed that there existed here at first the human and natural occasion for that journey, which received its higher consecration and significance only by the manifestation of the divine counsel. With as little solicitude does the author relate the marriage of Abraham with Sarah, his sister, without regard to the Mosaic prohibition of this[1] to which he must have had regard, if he freely invented what he wrote in the spirit of the subsequent theocratic statutes.[2] Now the fact of Abraham's emigration is re-

[1] Comp. J. D. Michaelis, On the Marriage Laws of Moses, p. 150, ff.

[2] Among the Patriarchs we find the custom prevailing throughout, of marrying among their relatives as much as possible. Michaelis l. c. p. 175. Connected with this, it is interesting to mark the parallel of the old Arabians before Muhammed, who were acquainted only with the prohibition of marriage with a mother or a daughter (Abulfeda, Hist. Anteisl. p. 180, Fleischer), till the Koran forbade also marriage with a sister (Sur.

markably confirmed by biblical, and also by foreign notices. First, by Josh. xxiv. 2, where it is said of Abraham's fathers, that they practised idolatry. From this we see that, in the age immediately succeeding that of Moses, certain traditions concerning that previous period were still preserved, the internal truth of which is all the better authenticated, the less that they tend to the honour and glory of Israelitish antiquity. Even if the name אוּר does not lead us to conclude with certainty as to the prevalence of light and fire-worship in that country, to which, besides, the clime itself and many analogies lead us;[1] yet, in the circumstance mentioned, there is expressed a complete agreement with Gen. xii. 1, as the reason of the divine command to Abraham to separate himself from his family. But among the Chaldeans also the memory of Abraham was preserved. The passage of Berosus, given in Josephus, Ant. i. 7, stands in remarkable agreement with Scripture: *μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ παρὰ Χαλδαίοις τις ἦν δικαῖος ἀνὴρ καὶ τὰ οὐράνια ἔμπειρος*. Here also the last words are important, since the Chaldean tradition traced its astrology so far back as that age, which says still more in favour of the statements adduced from Scripture. It ought also not to be overlooked, that Berosus is here speaking of the Chaldeans, not of the Babylonians, and from them accordingly the tradition was derived. The chronological statement however is especially remarkable; and here, as in the antediluvian chronology, there is exhibited in Berosus a remarkable fidelity in the preservation of the ancient traditional history.

iv. 27, Hinckelm.) Among other nations, on the contrary, we find the *more ancient* custom to have been the prohibition of marriage with a sister, which was done away with only by subsequent laxity of morals. So it was among the Persians before Cambyses (Herod. iii. 31, *οὐδαμῶς γὰρ ἐώθεσαν πρότερον τῇσι ἀδελφεῇσι συνοικέειν Πέρσαι*); but such marriages were prevalent among the Egyptians in the time of the Ptolemies, and certainly even earlier, Paus. i. 7, 1; Diod. Sic. i. 27; the latter of whom, however, fails not to remark, that this was contrary to the custom of most nations. This explains why, in Genesis, the Egyptians and Philistines do not believe that the sisters of the Patriarchs are their wives.

1 We remark here only on one point, the appellation, *Ur of the Chaldeans*. That the Chaldeans were even then a primitive priestly nation, is clear from the position which they afterwards occupied in Babylon. With this agrees the statement, important here, of Eupolemus in Euseb. Præp. Evan. ix. 17 (which is here the more deserving of credit, as it harmonises well with that which is to be adduced from Berosus, and Eupol. himself appears to have had no understanding of it)—that the name of the city was *Καμαρίνη i. e.*, unquestionably *City of priests* (comp. the Hebrew כמרים), and the constancy of the East in reference to such sacred localities, is shown most plainly by the instance of *Meröe*.

We find Abraham again, after his arrival in Canaan, in the quarter of Sichem and the grove of Moreh, while the land is already possessed by the Canaanites (xii. 6); from which, directing his course farther to the south, he pitches his tents between Bethel and Ai. The district about Sichem belongs to the most fertile in Palestine. "Mountains and vales, wells and fountains, a rich soil, pure air, fertilizing rains, abundance of fruits through the greatest part of the year, distinguish this district as far as the neighbourhood of Jerusalem" (Ritter, Erdkunde iii. p. 392.). At the same time the difficulty of approach to the country here affords it particular security against sudden invasions (Ritter, ibid.). This explains to us the selection of this locality on the part of Abraham, which is significantly hinted at by the reference to the Canaanites, about security against whom the stranger must have been most concerned.[1] On the other hand, there is no proof for the assertion of recent writers, that the author here gives an arbitrary geography, for the purpose of supplying a derivation of the origin of sacred and remarkable places. This also is the reason they give for naming in this place Sichem and Bethel (De Wette, p. 84, ff.). But how does it admit of being reconciled with that intention, that the author *in connection with* those places still speaks of the *grove* of Moreh, which even in the book of Judges appears only as the *hill of Moreh* (vii. 1), and gained indeed no renown at all, nor the city of Ai either? (Comp. Josh. viii.). Or how it can be explained in the case of Bethel, that this city,—which after the division of the kingdom was a constant seat of idolatry, while the Prophets speak of it with the greatest abhorrence (comp. Hos. iv. 15, x. 5),—subsequently became all at once such a subject of poetical honour, that the unholy city had now of a sudden the greatest sacredness attributed to it? Let him understand that who can![2] It may here

1 That view therefore is the more ridiculous, which holds that the reference to this circumstance supposes the expulsion of the Canaanites to have taken place, as we find it still given in Von Bohlen, p. 162: on the contrary, this circumstance is the motive that leads Abraham to select that place—exactly from a similar reason to that which has led to the insertion of the notice in xiii. 7; and accordingly the author must subjoin mention of the tribes with which the Patriarch now had to do. Besides, the author of Genesis evidences in this a knowledge of the Canaanites, and presupposes their nature and character to be known, in such a way as a late writer could not do. This is particularly clear from such passages as Num. xiv. 45.

2 There is yet less foundation for the objection, which is still made indeed by the most recent writers, that the name of Bethel was but a later one, and that *Luz* was the

be just mentioned in passing, as a frightful sample of this pseudo-criticism, how the history of these cities has been disfigured. According to Von Bohlen, p. 164, Sichem appears "*in history* along with Jeroboam, who built it (*beautified* is not proved), and raised it to the dignity of being his own residence, 1 Kings xii. 25." Did the man really not know, that according to 1 Kings xii. 1, Sichem already existed at that time? and that Jeroboam's building it was simply the restoration of the city after its destruction mentioned in Judges ix.? And this is history and historical research!

Being led by a famine to go down to Egypt, Abraham is there in danger of losing his wife; but by the help of Jehovah she is rescued and preserved to him. Here, in the first place, the circumstance of Abraham himself going to Egypt is genuine history. "In the time of Abraham, no corn trade as yet existed between Palestine and Egypt; he was therefore obliged, when a scarcity set in, to determine on travelling to Egypt in person along with his household; but in Jacob's time an active trade in corn was carried on by land on the part of Palestine with Egypt (xli. 57), and, to facilitate it, caravanserais were established on the way thither (xlvii. 27)." Eichhorn ii. p. 334. This internal advance, belonging altogether to the nature of those histories, and not at all sought for, is so striking as powerfully to disprove every charge of invention here. Here already we find the custom observed, as it is throughout the Pentateuch, of not calling the kings of Egypt by their individual names, but only designating them by the general title of honour *Pharaoh*, in which the Pentateuch is distinguished from the habit prevailing in the later books. If we compare, for instance, the next period, in which, subsequently to Moses, the Hebrews and Egyptians come in contact, and the record that gives an account of it,[1] a great difference will be observed in this point. In 1 Kings iii. 1, we read: פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם, and in 1 Kings xi. 40, שִׁישַׁק מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרַיִם. The Pentateuch never introduces an Egyptian ruler in that manner; a circumstance which is satisfactorily explained

more ancient name, which is grounded on Josh. xviii. 13, but without considering that Joshua is here only taking up again the older sacred names of the places, and also that not one passage can be adduced where the name *Bethel* is designated at a later period as one *newly come into use*. See also what is remarked below on *Hebron*.

1 The statement in the books of Kings refers for the history of Solomon to the כִּבְרֵי שְׁלֹמֹה as its source, 1 Kings xi. 41.

only by the fact that the author living in Egypt, and acquainted with the manner of the Egyptian court, which was under the constraint of the strictest formalities, thought and wrought as an Egyptian subject.[1] In like manner also it is here the שָׂרֵי פַרְעֹה, *Princes of Pharaoh*, who appear as his courtiers and servants (xii. 15), quite in accordance with the ancient custom of Egypt, that no slave should dare approach the consecrated priestly person of Pharoah, but the court and the royal suite consisted of the sons of the principal priests. (Diod. Sic. i. 70.).

On the other hand it has been regarded as an "inaccuracy and a blunder" in reference to Egypt (Von Bohlen, p. lv. and 164), that our record here assigns to Abraham animals of Palestine, which he could not have kept in Egypt; sheep and camels did not thrive in Egypt, and asses were the objects of an extraordinary hatred. It is at all events certain, that only such presents must have been made to Abraham, as were particularly valuable to him as a nomade;[2] hence it is exceedingly strange that Von Bohlen should be surprised that no *horses* were given to him—simply because these were properly indigenous to the valley of the Nile!—and it is still more strange to find the same writer believing that, because the ass had such a meaning in the Egyptian religion, it could not here have been made a present to a nomade, who, of course, could not be affected by such a notion at all. To this we may add the excellent remark of Heeren: "Religion appears to have had less influence on the breeding of cattle than might have been expected, in a nation where the worship of animals formed so essential a part of their religious observances" (Ideen ii. 2, p. 363), to which the same inquirer subjoins: "the breeding of asses and mules was always a domestic practice in Egypt—even on the monuments we meet with mules: they had spread over the whole of Northern Africa" (p. 365.).[3] The same is true of the breeding of camels in Egypt; they also appear on the monuments, and sheep also, not only single, but in droves (Heeren, p. 365, ff.).

1 We have quite an analogous instance to that mentioned in the text in Barhebræus, who, when speaking of the Mongolian kings, constantly employs their title of honour, "King of kings," Chron. p. 530, sq. ed. Bruns et Kirsch., even when the name is not given at all in what goes before. (Michaelis, Syr. Chrestom. p. 83, 4.)

2 "Hae potissimum Orientalium, praesertim Nomadum opes," says Clericus, quite correctly.

3 How well the ass thrives in that country, may be seen in Abdollatif, p. 140 and 155 ed. De Sacy.

As relates to the narrative itself, it must "contain an adventure, on which the popular legend dwelt with great delight, since, with a change of persons, it is recorded not less than three times." (Von Bohlen, p. 159.). "Most probably—says Vater iii. p. 430, comp. i. p. 222—it is the same fact, presented by the variations of tradition in three different forms" (comp. xx. and xxvi.). This assertion at once supposes what is not true, that the three events were attended with "the same circumstances and consequences" in the case of the father and the son. But this is decidedly incorrect. In each instance we have diversities of a local nature, and in other respects, and it is only the general circumstance, the threatened danger of the loss of a wife, that is common to them. But why should this general fact be a fictitious one? We have examples numerous enough of the same or a similar kind from the earliest antiquity (comp. Heidegger, Hist. s. patr. ii. p. 101); and the thing is one so entirely founded in the character and relations of the East, that, viewed on this side indeed, no doubt can remain as to its frequent occurrence. The frequent mention of the same matter then ought as little to surprise us, as the narration of similar accounts of miracles in the New Testament,[1] if it can only be shown that the fact was of such importance in the patriarchal history, that the author evidently had sufficient reason to incorporate it with it. For the intention cannot possibly have been merely to show, that the Patriarchs in this way gained themselves wealth and consideration, and thus in a corrupt mode to do their persons honour. In that case, if the author were one living at a late epoch, who freely invented and embellished histories of that sort, he could reckon but little indeed on the approbation of his contemporaries, to whom so much moral feeling must certainly be attributed, as to know that the persons of the Patriarchs were not quite honoured in this way.[2] Jehovah assuredly was honoured by it, inasmuch as he did not allow the promises he had made to fail—but this brings us to the important theocratic standing-point of the history, to that which completely supplies the

1 From which circumstance in the case of Matthew likewise, it is well known, a worthless argument against the genuineness of his gospel has been drawn; see Tholuck, Bergpredigt. p. 16, ff.

2 The finest remark on Abraham's transgression is that of Calvin on c. xii. 11, which he gives as the result of investigation: "Quamvis temerarii sint judices qui praecise damnant hoc factum Abræ, particularis tamen lapsus non negandus est, quod ob mortem propinquam trepidans discriminis eventum non commisit Deo, ne uxoris pudicitiam male proderet."

reason of its communication. "Acceperat Abrahamus promissionem—Heidegger, p. 109, excellently says—primo simplicem, postea etiam fœdere testamentario atque jurejurando sancitam, quod Deus ipsi atque semini ejus esse velit in Deum. Ne vero infirmitate suâ fidem atque veritatem promissionum divinarum infringi posse putaret Abrahamus ejusque posteri fideles, tum Deus permittere hunc raptum, in quo et infirmitas Abrahami et Dei veritas certis documentis notata est, tum Moses eum diligentissime describere voluit."

No trace of invention of any kind can be pointed out in the simple narrative of ch. xiii. The dealings of the Lord with Abraham, and the new promise (ver. 14, ff.), as on the one hand they take up again the earlier revelations, are on the other hand completely involved in the connexion of the history. A dispute separates the two relatives, who had hitherto lived in peaceful harmony with one another; but this separation is subservient to a higher plan of Jehovah's. It is not the posterity of Lot, but that of Abraham, that must obtain possession of the land; and while the latter, with a noble freedom from selfishness, offers Lot the selection of the best part, he must at the same time have remained convinced of the call, to which he was appointed by his God. Nowhere in this does the divine revelation appear as a *deus ex machinâ*, but as a real education of man, and therefore in closest harmony with his life. Let us imagine a writer, living at a later period, who had only Lot's posterity in his mind, and was disposed to display in his account of them the strongest national hatred (ch. xix. v., seq.); was it possible for such a one, to give here such a picture of the tender and intimate relation between Abraham and Lot, as his subsequent description exhibits? Would it have been possible for him—supposing for a moment that his standing-point was such a narrow-minded one—thus to satisfy himself, or to produce the intended effect on his readers? He would necessarily have been obliged, in case he was acquainted through tradition with such an earlier relation as this, either to pass it over altogether, or to give it an opposite turn and clothing; or we make him such an inconsistent narrator, that he becomes quite an enigma to us. To what then shall we refer it, that our record gives us just *such* an account as we have? Solely to its historical fidelity and credibility; but this demands most decidedly that we should go back to

the earliest period for the composition of so faithfully preserved a history.

To such a period also are we transported by the description of a district which subsequently wore quite a different aspect; our author knows exactly what was the appearance of the district of the Dead Sea before the destruction of the cities that existed there, ver. 10, ff., comp. xiv. 10 (see on that farther on).[1]—The age of the document is evidenced not less by the notice that Abraham dwelt *in the grove of Mamre beside Hebron* (xiii. 18.). The very objections that have been raised against the congruity of that notice,[2] testify here to the truth of the Mosaic record. It is a well-known custom of antiquity, in particular, that every city, whose name referred to the peculiar relations of the nation possessing it at the time, changed its name when it came into the possession of another party. Especially is it the case that, in the East, cities easily receive surnames, referring to particularly remarkable occurrences connected with a certain place. Now, in Genesis we find Hebron at first in the possession of the Amorites and Hittites, and Mamre the Amorite gave it its name of *Mamre* (comp. Gen. xiii. 18, xiv. 13, 24, with xxiii. 19—ממרא הוא חברון—xxxv. 27.). This name of the place occurs only in Genesis, from causes easy to comprehend. The name חברון appears as early, signifying "Place of alliance," and if we compare with that name the fact that is mentioned in xiv. 13,[3] that Abraham was allied with the chiefs of the Amorites, among whom he dwelt peacefully, the name will appear quite a suitable one. This name accordingly continued to be to the Hebrews the characteristic appellation, referring as it did to circumstances connected with their history. At a later period the Anakim came into possession of the place. From Arba, a powerful chief of this tribe

1 We shall here only add the remark, that our author in xiii. 10 employs *Egypt* as an illustration in comparisons (comp. Numb. xiii. 22; Deut. xi. 10, 11, 12.). That country, therefore, was supposed to be one quite well known in the author's time: *no* writer could express himself thus after the age of Moses: the comparisons of the later writers are constantly derived from Palestine, Lebanon, Hermon, &c.

2 V. Vater, iii. p. 631. Hartmann, p. 691, ff. Stäbelin, p. 108. Von Bohlen, p. 167, ff., &c. On the other side, though in different ways, Eichhorn iii. p. 165, ff. Jahn ii. p. 65. Kanne, l. c. p. 104, ff.

3 הם בעלי בריתי־אברם. The name of the place might certainly be referred also to the relations of the Amorites and Hittites; but from xxiii. 6, ff. it rather seems that the Hittites, who there have only *heard* of Abraham, had at a later time forcibly seized possession of the place; and besides, the derivation given in the text is manifestly quite a simple and obvious one.

(Josh. xiv. 15), the city took the name of *Kirjath-Arba*, Arba's city. This happened in the period anterior to Moses, for the spies whom Moses despatched find the *posterity* of Arba then in possession of the place (Num. xiii. 22, comp. Josh. xv. 14.). Consequently, in the Mosaic age the Anakite name of the city must have been in use, and well known. We nowhere find it said that Arba built the city; he simply gave it the name; and its earlier name might very well, according to the circumstances mentioned, be the twofold appellation of *Hebron* and *Mamre*. At the division of the land by Joshua, the city recovered its ancient consecrated theocratic name. The uncommonly precise statement in Num. xiii. 22, that Hebron was seven years older than Zoan, *i. e.* Tanis in Egypt, suffices to show how exact was the knowledge that the author of these records had of Egypt as well as of Palestine, and such a notice can be looked for only from Moses.[1]

Hence it follows, that only as being a *Mosaic* composition could the Pentateuch mention *together* the three names Mamre, Kirjath-Arba, and Hebron; comp. xxxv. 27.[2]—In the age immediately succeeding Moses, we find merely Kirjath and Hebron, see Josh. xiv. 15, xv. 13, Judges i. 10, while the remark is made, that *formerly* (לְפָנִים) the name of the city had been *Kirjath-Arba*, but in the Pentateuch, on the contrary, it is the *contemporaneous* name. In later writers, on the contrary, Hebron is the *only* name of the place, as 1 Sam. ii. 1. In still later writers the ancient name Kirjath-Arba *alone* occurs (Nehem. xi. 25.).[3] In all these periods no place is found for the appellation that is proper to the Pentateuch; and this peculiarity is the most decided evidence of its authenticity.

But on what support now does the argumentation of the opposers of the authenticity rest? On the bare postulate, "Caleb gave the city the name of Hebron." But not the slightest trace of this is found in the historical books; it is a purely *invented* fact. On the contrary, Josh. xiii. 10, xiv. 13, 14 is rather a proof that the Israelites, even before their occupation of the city, called it *Hebron*, and hence the other name was wholly a Canaanitish one. As Christian feeling could not be reconciled to the heathenish name Ælia

1 Comp. Studer, Comment. üb. d. B. der Richter, p. 21, ff.

2 Thus *Debir* also has three names in the Old Testament: Kirjath-sepher and Kirjath-sanna. So Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterthumskunde ii. 2, p. 305. So also the three names of Medinah; see Rommel, Abulf. descr. Arab. p. 73; or of Tagrit. see Döpke, ad Michaelis chr. Syr. p. 156, &c.

3 On this custom of the later writers, comp. *my* Comment. on Daniel, p. 16.

Capitolina, no more could theocratic feeling at the time of the occupation of Canaan tolerate the heathen names of the land and the cities; here, likewise, the memory of an ancient sacred past acquired necessarily the preponderance over the fashion of the present.

But it is then said that the narrative has a religious-antiquarian object: Hebron was a sacred place (2 Sam. xv. 7, ff.), the sacredness of which the narrator wished to trace up to Abraham (de Wette, p. 85, ff.), to which Gramberg (krit. Gesch. d. Relig. Id. d. A. T. i. p. 7) also adds that David once resided there. But it is by no means evident that there resulted thence any peculiar "sacredness" to the place: besides, in the passage 2 Sam. xv. it is only a vow that is spoken of, and for this all that was required was the presence of the priests (Levit. xxvii.), and Hebron was a city of the priests (Josh. xxi. 11.). That it became such, however, as well as a free city in the age of Joshua (xx. 8), is a proof of the great importance which even then was assigned it. "Of what particular consequence," Studer well remarks (l. c. p. 23), "the possession of this city must have been regarded as being, we learn from the circumstantiality with which the right of Caleb's family to it was justified and explained, comp. Josh. xiv. 6, ff., xv. 13; Judg. i. 20." How can we explain the fact of the city possessing such importance in that age? Let the statements of the book of Joshua be questioned, then again the books of Samuel become unintelligible. Thus we are driven back again upon the information here given of the occurrences that transpired at this place in the patriarchal age: these alone sufficiently explain the importance assigned to Hebron in Israelitish history, and place us in a condition to give it unity, instead of confusion and enigmatic perplexity.—But besides, how could the supposed religious-antiquarian object be well admitted, in accordance with the whole contents? In that which is quite a passing observation, we should hardly thus discover the main object of the narrative; and how can the preceding part, which is closely connected with this, be then explained?

The account of the expedition of Abraham in ch. xiv. transports us into a period so purely patriarchal, that we find nothing similar to it in Hebrew literature, and are rather completely reminded of the old Arabian age, as it is presented to us in the ancient heroic songs of that people. Here we have a remarkably copious number of indications of a record as faithful as it is early. In the first

place, we have the local appellations, quite peculiar and of primitive antiquity: *Bela* for Zoar, *Hazazon-Tamar* for Engedi (comp. 2 Chron. xx. 2), under which latter name the place appears in the age immediately subsequent to that of Moses,—Josh. xv. 62; Cant. i. 14; 1 Sam. xxiv. 1, 2; *Emek Shaveh*, Valley of the Plain, for the King's Vale, xiv. 17. The author is acquainted with the ancient name עמק שדים, xiv. 3, as the name of the place, where the Dead Sea afterwards arose, of which district he gives a description exactly agreeing with its local character, xiv. 10. In connection with this, however, the mention of *Dan*, xiv. 14, is said to be a "gross mistake," since the name did not come into use till a much later period (Josh. xix. 47; Judg. xviii. 29; comp. also Deut. xxxiv. 1.). This requires a closer examination. The Dan we are now speaking of was rightly sought by Josephus (Ant. i. 10, 1), at the sources of the Jordan: *περὶ Δάνου, οὕτω γὰρ ἡ ἑτέρα τοῦ Ιορδάνου προσαγορεύεται πήγη*. Josephus here also recognizes a place named *Dan*, Ant. v. 3, 1, viii, 8, 4, which according to Eusebius lay four miles west of Paneas, *Reland* Palest. p. 489, 502. Now this place *Dan* was unquestionably much more ancient than the other, which is unmistakeably evident from the passage 1 Kings xv. 20, comp. 2 Chron. xvi. 4, where, from its situation, as a city belonging to the tribe of Naphtali, it is only this Dan that can be intended. The same must also be understood in the present passage, and thus the combination which Josephus makes is quite correct: Abraham pursues the hostile kings up the vale of Jordan as far as the sources of the river, and drives them back thence into the district of Damascus (a military road went from Paneas to Damascus, Jos. de Bell. Jud. 3, 18); precisely as, in the contrary case, the Damascene king Benhadad immediately took possession of this territory—1 Kings xv. 20. The name of *Dan* in this quarter is referred by the common supposition to the settlement of the Danites here.[1] But that this cannot be the case, is plain beyond dispute (*a*) from Josh. xix. 32, according to which, the district of the sources of the Jordan belonged to the tribe of Naphtali (see Clericus ad h. l.); so that the Danite wanderers could never settle there. (*b*) The district of the new colony is also (Judg. xviii. 28) so defined as to be quite at variance with that supposition. According to that passage Laish (Leshem) lay in the valley

1 Comp. especially Gesenius on Burkhardt, Reise i. p. 494, ff.

of the city Beth-Rehob, which belonged to the tribe of Asher. This is the valley which led from Beth-Rehob to Hamath, Num. xiii. 21, and consequently no other than the great valley separating Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, named at present *al Bekaa*,[1] Cœlesyria in its more restricted sense (Ritter, p. 306.). (*c.*) The designation of Dan as the northernmost city of Palestine in the phrase, "from Dan to Beersheba," does not allow us to think of Dan in the tribe of Naphtali, which that character does not agree with at all, but suits very well with that which lay in the above-mentioned quarter. Thus we have the existence of two *Dans* in the Old Testament proved, and by that also the truth of the statement in Genesis sustained.

In the same section there appear also other historical notices, that afford evidence of its high antiquity. The way in which it begins; "in the days of Amraphel, &c," by which the war receives its chronological definition from the time of the reigns of those kings (see Hitzig, Begr. d. Krit. p. 149), supposes a writer, to whom that fact was so well known, that he could in this way bring it chronologically before the minds of his contemporaries.[2] Among the hostile ranks *Elam* stands foremost, which agrees well with what we know from history of the character of that nation.[3] Among the conquered people appear nations, that must have belonged to the primitive history of Canaan; thus the *Rephaim*, mentioned as a nation only in the Pentateuch (see Deut. iii. 13), in the book of Joshua as being but a weak remnant (Josh. xiii. 12), and employed in the later books only in poetical description, connected indeed with the old tradition, but assigning the word a different sense:[4]—so also the Zuzim, Emim, Chorim, who also appear only in the Pentateuch (Deut. ii. 10, 12.). So likewise the manners and customs here are quite peculiar. Abraham arms his warriors וירק את־חניכיו, xiv. 14, a military expression that is found only here. But the description of the person of Melchizedek is most remarkable of all. "None of those forms of the old world are to be found more grandly and purely preserved,—says Creuzer, Symb. iv. 378.—The Greek fictions are far inferior

1 Comp. Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. p. 155 ed. Köbler; Ritter, Erdk. ii. p. 435. Burkhardt i. p. 79, 377.

2 It is therefore truly absurd of Von Bohlen to say, p. 170: "to him also (the narrator) the period was one ancient and long past!"

3 See my Comment. on the book of Daniel, p. 543, ff.

4 V. Vitringa ad Jes. xiv. 9. Pareau de immortalit. notit. etc. p. 125.

to him." According to this enquirer, the memory of a patriarchal antiquity, wherein royalty and priesthood appear in close union, became but a child's tale in the mouth of the loquacious Hellenes. "Simple, calm, and great does the priestly King of the divine history come before us and depart." And regarded even in the simple sublimity of the description, we ask, could a later Theocrat represent an object in such a way from his own invention? That combination of priestly and kingly dignity was something not at all given or founded in theocratic relations; hence the later Psalmist, when wishing to represent in prediction such a combination, is obliged to go back to that extra-theocratic historical circumstance, Ps. cx. 4. Farther, this priestly king, although his pious disposition is clearly expressed in the blessing which he pronounces on the patriarch, is yet by no means a priest of Jehovah: his God is אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ (comp. with that, ver. 22), and these designations of the Deity we find again in the Phœnician religions,[1] from which it is clear that we have here in a purer state the original element of a religion and worship that became afterwards more corrupt. Abraham gives the tithe to Melchizedek according to an ancient widely-spread usage (Dougtæi anal. sac. p. 15, sq.). How could an occurrence so peculiar be described by an author, who had before his eyes only an entirely different form of the idolatry by which Palestine was encompassed? how could it even come into his mind to idealise this person in such a way; and how should he then cause Abraham here to pay the dues that were afterwards assigned to the priests? How is all this to be reconciled with the "national hatred" to Canaan, which is attributed to the author as his design, and which he must then likewise, as a consequence, have indulged by strictly following such a mode of representation as should serve for a defence of it?[2]

In spite of this character which the present section possesses, recent criticism has ventured the assertion, that the narrative certainly has not so much as one traditional event as its foundation (V. Bohlen, p. 168.). "It is a suspicious story, (it is said), that the

1 Comp. Münter, Relig. d. Karthager, p. 5, 6, 7: see also Schelling, d. Gotth. v. Samothr. p. 83.

2 Jewish narrow-mindedness, which could not rise to the magnanimous view presented in our record, at an early period made out of Melchizedek, *Shem*, &c. v. Deyling obss. s ii., p. 75, sq.

powerful rulers of Upper Asia, should march in person with combined forces against a revolted district only some miles in extent." What an assertion! With inexplicable rashness "powerful rulers of Upper Asia" are here talked of, of whom our informant expresses no knowledge in any way, but who are *supposed*, because—an acquaintance with the historical relations of a later period must be attributed to him (V. Bohlen, p. 170, ff.). Could there be a stranger instance of reasoning in a circle? And was it then the object of Chedorlaomer only to subjugate again the rebellious kings? According to ver. 5, ff., it is evident that he was incited as much by the heedless love of conquest. That also is wilfully overlooked, and to so futile an argument a second is added, which, if possible, even exceeds the first. "The district, which they endeavour to conquer, did not so much as exist." How so? because "the submerged cities have no existence but in traditional story, and the Dead Sea was known to the Hebrews as such from the earliest period." Here again is a miserable instance of reasoning in a circle. Our narrative—which, observe, is the only one that from the nature of the case could be acquainted with the Dead Sea *not* as such [*i. e.* before it became such]—is a *traditional story*, consequently, &c. Our record is of *late* origin, consequently since the earliest period the Dead Sea was known as such to the Hebrews. Such wanton procedure has never been attempted with a narrative of Livy, or any other profane author; but the word of God must submit to every kind of wanton criticism. "Besides, later political relations are here supposed to exist in antiquity." Is it those of Palestine? No; these are again passed over in wilful ignorance; but those of Upper Asia. "Elam or Media here takes the lead." But where in all the world do we find Elam and Media synonymous? The Old Testament writers, and even our record in ch. x., constantly make an exact distinction between the two lands. But the narrator is also "unconcerned about the more exact political definitions," hence our critic makes him on the one hand represent Media as having extricated itself from the Assyrian dominion, and on the other hand have an earlier period in view with respect to the Assyrians and Chaldeans (sic!). In this way, indeed, every absurdity and contradiction may be attributed to an author. "At length pure fiction appears in Abraham's defeating the united hosts with 318 men and three allied Amorites, and pursuing them the distance of twenty

miles[1] through all the Canaanitish tribes." Here also our critic acts as if he knew precisely the strength of the hostile army, so as to be able, accordingly, to judge of the disproportion; he wilfully leaves out of view also, that the narrative, in speaking of the defeat of the inhabitants of the vale of Siddim, makes express mention of the unfavourableness of the ground for them (xiv. 10); and in the same manner he takes no notice of Abraham's victory being connected with a nocturnal surprise, after he had divided his band into separate parties (xiv. 15); and he arbitrarily *invents* the circumstance of Abraham's pursuing them those twenty miles; while here all that is spoken of is that he pursued and overtook them at Dan (xiv. 14, 15.).

Passing on to ch. xv., we there first meet with a remark that is quite cursory and unintentional, in ver. 3, but which discloses a very ancient custom, that afterwards had nothing corresponding to it.[2] According to that, in case of childlessness, a slave was heir; but this slave here appears under the very peculiar appellation, referring to special nomadic relations: בן-משק ביתי.—Not less peculiar is the covenant-sacrifice that is here described, which is especially remarkable in its relation to the theocratic covenant-sacrifice, which differs very much from it in its rites: see Exod. xxiv. This very circumstance stands directly opposed to every supposition of fiction in the present passage, which, were it fiction, would certainly prove a mere *copy* here. Add to this, that the present rite is evidenced as being the more ancient and original, representing completely the symbolical action; but on the contrary, Ex. xxiv., where the blood is only sprinkled on both sides, without the covenanting parties passing actually between the slaughtered victims, appears as a modified usage, abbreviating that ancient complete form, as is wont generally to be the case with rites of that kind. Besides, it ought not to be overlooked, that the rite mentioned in Genesis wears more of a universal character, connected with heathen usages, while, on the contrary, that which is described in Exodus has a more particular and theocratic character (see Winer, p. 236); indeed, according to a statement, which is certainly of late date, being that of Ephraem Syrus, the same custom was found among the Chal-

1 German miles, of course; equal to ninety English miles.—Tr.

2 Unde colligere licet, moris tunc fuisse, ut si quis sine prole decederet, verna familiæ præfectus hæres ipsi fieret. Rosenmüller, p. 294, comp. Winer, Reallex. i. p. 304.

deans, which leads that Father to explain this passage as being connected with an ancestral custom of Abraham's; see C. de Lengerke, de Ephr. Syri arte herm. p. 13.[1]

This section shows how, in connection with divine promises of the most remarkable nature, exceeding all human expectation, the faith of Abraham, however frequently and greatly it might be in danger of wavering, was confirmed and strengthened on the part of Jehovah in a truly pædagogic method; so that he persevered in the same faith as a true servant of his God. Hence a sign is now given him in a solemn manner, by which he may learn that Jehovah enters into quite a peculiar relation to him, as he does with no other inhabitant of the earth. Associated with this sign, however, there is a constant reference to the one great promise which reaches far into the future; which here appears, where a new animation of his much assailed faith is concerned, not as the mere repetition of what was previously announced, but as a still more exact definition of it, so that the friend of God may know that the counsel of God is as precisely defined and unchangeably certain as it is wonderful and glorious. Hence the promise has here a twofold reference, to time and place; but always in peculiarly prophetic style describing the outlines of the object: a foreign land in general,—400 years as the time of servitude, from which the fourth generation shall escape,—limits from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates, are announced by the prediction;—all so genuinely prophetical, and at the same time so accordant with Abraham's point of view, that we are here obliged to recognize entire historical truth.

It is the more strange that this historical character has been refused to this section, and that it has been determined to explain it as poetry. According to De Wette Beitr. p. 77, ff., a comparison of ch. xvii. should make this especially clear, since the poet proves himself to be an imitator of this latter piece, who here embellishes at greater length the subject that is there reported in a simpler manner. Certainly in both places it is a covenant-relation that is spoken of, as the basis of the narrative; but the narratives themselves are quite distinct from one another. In ch. xvii. it is not the founding of such a relation that is spoken of at all; but such a connection is

[1] The passage Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19 may very well be taken as only an allusion to the present (comp. ver. 13), even because of the expression ברית, which in this reference is peculiar to Genesis; Bochart, Hieroz. i. p. 333. Rosenm.

there rather presupposed as established, and it is only a new token of it that is given; so that what there was in it to imitate, cannot be discovered. De Wette should rather have satisfied himself with affirming, that the simple idea of God's making a covenant with Abraham, is in this way embellished by the poet; but he says not a syllable to touch or to prove the point that the detailed form of that idea here is an inadmissible, or, in the way in which it is represented, an impossible one. Von Bohlen indeed is of opinion (p. 178), that the defenders of the Mosaic origin are here involved in a dilemma by the prophecy in xv. 13, ff., since it must then be looked upon as a *vaticinium post eventum*—a conclusion which is not obvious, since just on the contrary, if that prediction was really a previous one, it is indisputable, that at the time of its fulfilment it must have possessed a special importance for the Mosaic period, but afterwards by no means so; hence it is strange, that a much later writer should have hit on the thought of inventing such a prophecy, which for him and his era had not at all that interest and importance. The mention of the Kenites in verse 19, is also regarded as speaking against the Mosaic composition, who according to Judges i. 16, iv. 11, sprung first from the brother-in-law of Moses: Von Bohlen, p. 182; Stähelin, p. 110. But the contrary is plain from Num. xxiv. 21, where mention is made of this people. In the passages of the book of Judges, besides, Moses' father-in-law is called "the Kenite;" how can he then have first given this people their name?[1]

The narrative of Hagar (ch. xvi.) has such a colouring, answering to the patriarchal life, and to the spirit of the East in general, that even Winer (Realw. p. 532) here and in ch. xxi. was led to recognize in it a purely historical tradition. At bottom, also, it is only what is miraculous in this history, that makes recent writers find a mythus here, as is openly expressed, *e. g.* by Hartmann, p. 411, ff. Von Bohlen believes that everywhere in the narrative an intentional aim is manifest, and that in this way the inventor betrays himself. He desired to explain the origin of two Arabian tribes, the Hagarenes and the Ishmaelites, and at the same time to illustrate a well-known local name. This is a strange sort of intention! The first people was one small individual branch of the many Arabian tribes,

1 I see no sufficient reason to correct, with Studer (Comment. p. 32, ff.) the passage in Judges i. 16: the textus receptus gives the good sense, well suited to the connection: "the sons of a Kenite," namely the father-in-law of Moses.

but the name of Ishmaelites a more general appellation of a greater number of tribes: how came it about that from the former name that of the mother should be borrowed, but from this collective appellation that of the son? Farther, if we consider, that the Israelites lived only in hostile collision with these their neighbour-nations, so that in Ps. lxxxiii. 7, they appear among the hereditary foes of Israel, a narrative of this kind can still less be conceived of as a later invention. Certainly "the whole representation tends to attach a slight stain to the Arabians." (Von Bohlen, p. 183.). But with this the divine assistance, imparted to Hagar according to this account, will badly agree. Still less, however, does it then appear explicable, how it is even Abraham, and particularly Sarah, who are here represented as deficient in faith and as acting ungratefully towards the divine promise. An especial stain here falls on *them;* let that circumstance be explained, if it was not the historical fidelity of the writer that led him to do homage to truth by giving precisely such an account and no other. In fine, also, the collisions of the Israelites with the Hagarenes and the Ishmaelite Arabians, belong to the earlier periods of the history of this people; v. Judg. viii. 24, 1 Chron. v. 18—21, comp. v. 10, and Keil üb. d. Chron. p. 178: afterwards they disappear altogether from Israelitish history. Why then should those names here obtain all at once so surprising an importance? As relates to the local name, this again is one of the strongest proofs of the truth of the narrative. How in all the world came one to give a place the strange remarkable name of באר לחי ראי? It is indeed proposed to change the vowels, in order to bring out another sense than that given in the text; but apart from the violence of that procedure, and the still stranger interpretation[1] arising out of it, how could the writer then arrive at this explanation of it? This gives evidence as clear as the sun of the accuracy of the Masoretic punctuation. But then let another explanation of this Masoretic text be furnished than that which is given in this document! The attempts at this that have hitherto been made, and which are always obliged to take refuge in alterations of the reading, prove clearly that it is impossible. But if the explanation in Genesis is correct, the fact connected with it is also at the same time amply vindicated.

[1] Which led Von Bohlen in connection with ראי to think of the Greek ῥοή;—truly an act of desperation!

§ 19. CONTINUATION. GEN. XVII.—XXV.

While De Wette, in a purely dogmatic method, sets out primarily from the idea of the impossibility of a covenant-relation between God and Abraham, and of his cherishing the faith that God would fulfil the promise of a posterity to him, and decides accordingly on ch. xvii. being a poetic fiction; on the other hand historical grounds have been sought, on which to attack the truth of this narrative. Two hypotheses of this character have been proposed, agreeing in this point, that circumcision is a foreign rite borrowed from a heathen people, while some regard the Egyptians,[1] and others the surrounding heathen nations in the neighbourhood, with their custom of castration,[2] as its originators; but placing its age later at least than that given here. But, in the first place, it is of no consequence in a critical respect whether the custom was borrowed or not; for, supposing that it was, how shall it be shown that this might not take place quite as well in the time of Abraham as at a later period? That there were other nations, who, as far as the external part of the custom went, were acquainted with it in an unconnected and independent form, such as the inhabitants of America or of the South Sea Islands, proves only that, in examining the agreement in this custom, we must have regard, not to its external and material part, but to its internal significance in relation to its origin. There, however, the peculiarity of the Hebrew rite is strikingly brought out. It has here an intimate relation to the covenant of Jehovah with Abraham and his people—comp. especially xvii. 10, 11. This relation stamps on the rite so peculiar a character, that it cannot be deduced from a foreign idea, such as that of ascetic castration, &c., but forms rather the pure original substratum, with which all the rest is connected only as corruptions belonging to a lower and narrow sphere. As far as the idea of such a covenant is removed from being a mere human one, instead of a truly divine self-testification to humanity, so far also, consequently, must the expression of that idea, its external symbol, be removed from the same. Now it is just this covenant-relation that forms the fundamental principle of the then future Theo-

1 So, supported chiefly by Herodotus ii. 37, 104, most recent writers, as Winer, Realw. p. 186. Ammon, Fortbild. d. Christenth. i. p. 114. Von Bohlen, p. 191, ff., &c.

2 So *e. g.* Vatke, Bibl. Theol. i. p. 381, 682.

cracy; so that along with it the previous existence of that symbol is likewise necessarily supposed. Hence it is only the external necessary consequence of that early appointment of circumcision, that it appears as the indispensable mark of distinction given to the instruments which God had called and intended to prepare for the realizing of the theocratic institution; comp. Gen. xxxiv.; Ex. iv. 24, ff. Thus the whole subsequent Theocracy, its history and organization, cannot be understood without the previous existence of that rite; nowhere is it enjoined anew, but rather everywhere presupposed; comp. Ex. xii. 44, 48; Levit. xii. 3. And as it is with the Mosaic age, so is it also with the following one. Immediately after the entrance into Canaan, it is Joshua's first care to attend to the circumcision of the people. And against those who seek to throw suspicion on this statement of the book of Joshua also (Von Bohlen, p. 193), the book of Judges may be brought, where in the age immediately following we meet with a like view: Judg. xiv. 3, xv. 18. Thus one testimony here supports the other, and a person must declare all the records to have been falsified, to be able arbitrarily to decide the dispute in a way agreeable to his prejudices.

Among the Egyptians, according to their own statements, the custom of circumcision was one of primitive antiquity: see Herod. ii. 104. Why then should we dispute to the Hebrews the same antiquity in this matter? The Egyptians certainly affirmed also that the neighbouring nation of the Hebrews had adopted the custom from them; at any rate the acquiescence of the Greek authors in this saying was connected with their opinion that the Jews were descended from the Egyptians. (Diod. Sic. i. 28; Strabo xvii. p. 824.). The Phenicians, however, declared that circumcision was derived from Kronos, so that they also transfer it to mythical times (Sanchon. p. 36 ed. Orelli.). Herodotus also admits that all the Phenicians did not practice circumcision, but only those dwelling in Palestine, *i.e.* the Jews (Bähr ad Herod. i. p. 716.). Accordingly the national Phenician tradition conceded to the usage, in reference to that part of the nation that was acquainted with it, an origin falling wholly within the limits of the hoariest antiquity; and thus by an impartial examination of the statements of ancient times, we are brought back to the Bible-ground as that which has the firmest foundation.

Let us see now, whether the mythical point of view has more in its favour in the narrative of the destruction of Sodom, ch. xviii. xix. Four points, in reference to this, demand our especial attention. There is, in the first place, the fact here reported of the visit of Jehovah as a guest, accompanied by two angels, to the tent of Abraham.

That Abraham was honoured with special revelations of the Lord, is so closely connected with the whole peculiarity of his position, that, in order to deny the former, the latter must itself be altogether set aside. It is, therefore, merely the peculiar form of those revelations in the present passage that we have to do with, an inquiry which is of the greatest importance in reference to our views of the patriarch's life and conduct in general. Jehovah associates with him, as one friend with another, as the most tender father with his dearest child: the revelation of God here assumes a character of freedom from restraint, and bears evidence of being one that pervaded the whole life of the patriarch, in a manner that we do not find elsewhere, either earlier or later, in the history of Israel. The reason of this peculiarity is supplied to us in the words of Jehovah, xviii. 18, ff. Abraham is, on the one hand, the person, in whom all the nations of the earth are to be blessed: on the other hand, he appears subjectively as the most believing recipient, the most faithful guardian, of the divine blessings, training up for Jehovah a truly devoted race; hence in a special sense he is "the friend of God."—But it is not merely the peculiar subjective character of the patriarch, but principally the peculiarity of his divine appointment to be the father of a new economy of God (Rom. iv. 9—12), that gives those revelations such a special distinction, that we must not apply to them as a rule and measure the conclusions we might be disposed to draw from the analogy of other revelations in other circumstances. Every revelation of God, as a testimony of salvation, is guidance, a fact that educates. Hence, in the case of Abraham also, we must derive the ground of our decision from the infancy of mankind (of course in a higher sense than the recent theology is accustomed to do), from the commencement of the divine εὐλογία as connected with a certain individual. Where man, moving in the simpler circumstances of the life of ancient times, has preserved more of the simple and childlike feeling itself, there the Deity also, when revealing himself, displays especial condescension; indeed he

can appear, speak, and act, only in the way that the God of Abraham here does. In no other way could the patriarch attain the elevated position, in which he could embrace and survey the glorious promise in all its importance and grandeur. Hence the revelation of God to Moses in Exod. iii. 5, ff., is from the very commencement quite of another character: the standing-point of the law is there clearly defined by the words, "draw not nigh hither," and is thus essentially distinct from the procedure with Abraham, as in that the standing-point of the gospel has chief prominence.

From this it is evident how little to the purpose are such declamations, as that these revelations are unworthy of God, &c.,[1] since they rest on this broad foundation. The opponents of the reality of these revelations should rather occupy themselves chiefly with showing, that the peculiarity of this mode of revelation stands in disagreement with, and opposition to, the peculiar circumstances of the patriarch's life. But these, as they can be comprehended and estimated only as the result of the former, prove exactly the necessity and truth of the revelation of Jehovah, as the supposition which they imply. To point out therefore the disagreement referred to is a pure impossibility, and nothing is left for the opponents, but to retreat to arbitrary common-places, and to be content with dictatorial assertions, such as the simple dictum: "it cannot and must not have been so," leaving unanswered the question, "why not?"

From this point of view, then, we know also how to estimate properly the parallels that have often been adduced from heathen mythi, such as that of Philemon and Baucis.[2] In this, the altered form (which in the present case however is highly probable[3]), given to the same fact in the heathen mythology, can have only a subordinate importance to us. The peculiarity of the idea, exhibited in the covenant-relation of Jehovah to Abraham, is entirely wanting in the mythological element; this very comparison shows it to be unique in its kind, an evidence that it is not derived from man, but is one truly divine. Now on this idea the theocratic fact rests wholly and solely. Thus at the most we can admit no more

1 Thus *e. g.* Hartmann, p. 412, ff., who will have all this to be the invention of "national pride!"

2 Comp. especially Bauer's Hebr. Mythol. i. p. 238, ff.

3 Comp. Clericus, App. Comm. in Genes., p. 369, sq: Gelpke, Symb. ad int. l. Act. xiv. 8—18, in the Comment. Theol. ed. Rosenm. ii. 2, p. 302—313.

than a merely external similarity, which however is no true similarity, since the historical vindication of the fact depends on its higher internal significance.

Yet the example of the Old Testament itself may show us how little reason there is to suppose that invention has place here. While Jehovah enters Abraham's abode as a guest, and partakes of the food that is set before him; in the history of Manoah, on the contrary, (Judges xiii. 15, 16, comp. vi. 21) "the angel of Jehovah" expressly declines to do so. How shall we explain this difference? Certainly not from an "advancement of religious conceptions;"[1] for, supposing that the religious conception of the Hebrew took offence at such an intercourse of Jehovah with men, it would then have avoided this offensive matter the one time as well as the other: besides, that we cannot make out how this agrees with the view of Genesis having so late an origin as it is thought justifiable to assign it. But we shall gain a complete and satisfactory comprehension of the difference, if we pay regard to the time and the persons in each case, as Jehovah places himself in a different relation to them according to the peculiar diversity between them. In Abraham's case, so intimate a relation subsists between him and his God, that he obtains a distinction which, in accordance with his exalted vocation, he only could obtain; but another relation comes before us, where the standing-point of the theocratic law had revealed the alienation between God and man, and the majesty of God is there, even as on Mount Sinai, a majesty fenced around with bounds that may not be passed. Thus the later theocratic history by its peculiarity affords a remarkable confirmation of the earlier life of primitive times, which diverges from it; and thence it appears at the same time, that from that later standing-point it was really impossible to transfer one's self by the mere force of invention into a state of things that existed earlier, but had now given way to an entirely different one.

Jehovah does not stay in Abraham's tent, without giving him a testimony of his favour. He gives him a new solemn promise in reference to the birth of a son. De Wette, Beitr. p. 86, ff., here discovers a contradiction of xvii. 15–21, as well as of xxi. 5–7; compare also Hartmann p. 269. The etymology of the name

1 So Studer on the book of Judges p. 182.

יצחק is represented as having given occasion to these narratives, which are irreconcilable with one another. This is a very incorrect observation. The passage xxi. 5, ff. has necessarily a retrospective reference to the earlier passages: God, says Sarah, has prepared laughter for me, (*i.e. joy*, v. Ps. cxxvi. 2.). When the promised event has occurred, the name of the child is made to harmonize as much with that, which must then be the case, as with what had previously taken place. "That at which I formerly laughed (such is the sense of this passage), has now been so turned by God that it has become to me the subject of laughter, of joy." Thus does the thought first receive the whole of its true meaning. Now how can there be a contradiction here of what goes before? How can De Wette conclude from this passage, that this narrator appears to have known nothing of the previous promise of Isaac's birth? Abraham and Sarah had now both given up the hope of that announcement being fulfilled. The thought is well expressed by the narrator both times by means of a paronomasia, and an allusion to the name of the child; both of them laugh. The child is born: in truth, he adds, it is a subject of laughter and rejoicing. Thus all the three narratives are closely and correctly connected together. In our record there is no thought of a proper strictly so-called "*derivation* of the name of Isaac," (De Wette, p. 89): it is the simple naïve oriental mode of narration, which delights in a pregnant style of expression. This might come about the more readily, since because of the first laugh of Abraham God had commanded him to call his son יצחק, xvii. 19. Besides, there is a remarkable exemplification in the announcement of Isaac, which becomes always more special and definite (comp. xvii. 16, 19, with xviii. 14), of what we have already remarked of the pædagogic advancement in the divine procedure with Abraham. The farther he believes himself to be from his desired object, the more is it brought home to his heart, and with the greater impressiveness, that the ways and counsels of God are not his. That is the best internal criterion of the truth of our history.

With regard now to the fact of the origin of the Dead Sea in the manner stated in our document, it is that statement precisely that recent writers have been most disposed to charge with traditionary embellishment and poetical invention. While De Wette contents himself in proof of this view with appealing to the commencement of the narrative, the "fiction of the three divine guests," (p. 91);

others have laboured to seek out more reasons, perhaps from a feeling of the insufficiency of the grounds that have been adduced from doctrinal prepossessions. Thus Hartmann (p. 416) is of opinion that the mythus betrays itself by the "purposely aggravated delineation of the violent and profligate conduct practised by the inhabitants of Sodom;" and that the author is inconsistent in not making a similar statement concerning the rest of the cities in the region of Jordan. But in what goes before, repeated notice had been taken of the sins of "Sodom and Gomorrha," comp. xiii. 13, xviii. 20, where the comparison with xviii. 24, ff., shows very clearly, that we have here *pars pro toto*: Sodom, as the chief of those cities, embraces them also as belonging to it, and hence also it is in it, on the entrance of the angels, that the most open display of the wickedness of those inhabitants is presented to us. But that their criminal conduct (xix. 5, ff.) is by no means a fiction, is shown by the history in Judg. xix., where we meet with the same thing in the case of the Benjamites, who had adopted those enormities of lewdness from the Canaanites, see Levit. xviii. As, according to the last passage, pæderasty had become a custom with those nations, one should be the farther from thinking that we have here a "purposely aggravated delineation." It is still stranger to find De Wette of opinion, that to that historical event in the book of Judges, the narrative in Genesis is to be traced as a copy of it (p. 92.). Yet, with the exception of the common sin of lewdness, there is not even the least analogy to be discovered between the two occurrences! Let it however be admitted, that, from the historical knowledge that we otherwise possess of the Canaanites, we have evident confirmation of the crime being naturalized among them, so that it need not surprise us to see it make its appearance here. At the same time this supplies a striking testimony to the historical credibility of the present account, which completely shields it from every charge of "exaggeration."

An especially bold turn has been given by Von Bohlen to these objections to the historical truth of the narrative (p. 202, ff.). He proceeds on the supposition, that the destruction of those cities as found in all the Hebrew writers, is reported only from the popular tradition, which had almost become a kind of proverb; but such a tradition readily cleaves to districts, where a previous revolution of nature has continued in remembrance, &c. In that case we ought

to have in the Old Testament not a tradition, but *traditions* concerning the event. We should then be surprised, at any rate, that we meet with unity in them. Bu tnow we discover not only this, but the *drigin* of them also it is quite impossible to mistake. If we bring together all the later (incidental) expressions of the prophets concerning the fact, we shall find that, in the first place, they suppose it to be a well-known thing. Isaiah requires only to say, "We should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrha," and, "Ye rulers of Sodom, ye people of Gomorrha," i. 8, 9; and the sins as well as the punishment of those cities stand in their complete detail before the eyes of the prophet and his readers also. But wherever such references occur, it is this account that is taken as the foundation, not merely in general, but *in its very words*. Thus Is. iii. 9 unquestionably refers to Gen. xix. 5, on which Hitzig p. 36 remarks: "this reference shows that Isaiah had the narrative Gen. xix. before him in a written form;" so also Ps. xi. 6 comp. Gen. xix. 24. From Gen. xix. 25, 29 (comp. Deut. xxix. 22) are derived the peculiar expressions used only of these cities הֲפֵכָה and מַהְפֵּכָה, comp. Is. i. 7, xiii. 19; Amos iv. 11; Jerem. xlix. 18, l. 40 Hitzig on Is., p. 8.[1] This shows that all the knowledge that later writers possessed concerning the event, rested solely on the statement in Genesis, as it stands thus at the head of all that was known respecting the matter among the Hebrews, bearing evidence of being the original account. Besides, the only book which furnishes a somewhat more detailed statement concerning the destruction of those cities, is the Pentateuch itself, in Deut. xxix. 22, where certainly the reference to Genesis is unquestionable, but still Sodom, Gomorrha, Admah, and Zeboim are spoken of as *destroyed* cities, according to the contents of Gen. xix. 25, comp. x. 19, xiv. 2, 8; and to that Hos. xi. 8, refers; a sure proof that at that time nothing more was known of the event, than what the Pentateuch related.

In the next place, Von Bohlen asserts that the occurrence should be explained differently from what is done in Genesis. Owing to the nature of the soil, the plain, being impregnated with salt and brimstone, continued burning when it was once kindled, like the

1 In Abulfeda an equivalent Arabic phrase is used, signifying *terra inversa*. Tab. Syr. p. 12 Köhler.

so-called burning fields at the Caspian Sea, till at length the crust of the earth sank in, and water came in its place, while here and there crystallized rocks of salt remained standing (p. 203.). Whether this hypothesis, which, however, is far enough from being a new one, explains the wholly peculiar character of the Dead Sea, and of this region in general, admits of being tested by the judgment of one who has a knowledge of this department. "As the Jordan—says Ritter, Erdk. ii. p. 342, 343—is like no other river, so is this sea like no other sea in the world; it is only the external appearance of the collection of waters—the mathematical dimension—that causes it to be reckoned with the other seas; *its nature is entirely different from theirs.*"—"Useless hypotheses, belonging to the region of possibilities, in explanation of this event (Gen. xix.), without local knowledge, have at all times not been wanting. They go no farther, however, than the oldest of all, that of Eratosthenes, who traced the formation of the Dead Sea to Cyclopean forces bursting forth from a subterranean basin, on which the mountain strata lying above fell together again; an hypothesis which, at least in the district of the cavernous Jura limestone, is not a mere groundless fancy, and perhaps will go as far in the way of explanation as any of the others." Besides this, there is here an exegetical reason that requires the entire rejection of the proposed hypothesis. Reland (Pal. p. 254, sq.) has already satisfactorily shown that the vale of Siddim, in the place of which the Dead Sea subsequently arose (xiv. 3), is not that where the situation of Sodom, &c., lay, but that the opposite rather is manifest from the words, חברו אל־עמק השדים.[1] Accordingly, Genesis supplies no information at all concerning the origin of the Dead Sea, as is commonly supposed; and a submersion by water is not at all spoken of here (comp. also Ritter, l. c.), but rather, on the contrary, it is everywhere a destruction by fire and conflagration. "The land is burnt with brimstone and salt"—it is said, Deut. xxix. 22. This circumstance completely

1 Reland was opposed particularly by J. D. Michaelis, De Mari mortuo, § xiii. But his reasons in no way weaken those of Reland. Supposing, however, that it were even so that those cities lay in the vale of Siddim, still their sinking into the sea remains a fact foreign to Genesis, of which it takes no farther notice, probably because the formation of water was a later fact, which, as a simple occurrence in nature, had nothing more to do with the patriarchal history. So far is our record from being concerned only with the explanation of physical singularities, in which it is remarkably different from the local mythi of the heathen, its aim is always a higher dogmatico-ethical one.

annihilates the view which represents the popular tradition as readily attaching itself to dangerous "bays of the sea-coast, inland seas," &c. If this really were all, then the character of the Dead Sea, the accounts of which appeared even to Aristotle fabulous and doubtful (Meteorol. ii. 3, Reland, p. 250), must above all have attracted remark from tradition; but the kind of information that we find here, is on that view incapable of explanation.

Let it then only be granted, what cannot be concealed by denial, that in the present narrative there is a rare openness and fidelity of communication. The narrator knew nothing more than what he states, and the information he gives is also shown by all physical observations to be as far as possible from being false. What then is it properly that interpreters have to reject in the present account, as incredible and unimaginable? Our author no more passes over the peculiar local character of the soil, which must have contributed to increase the fearfulness of that conflagration (xiv. 10),[1] than he fails, on the other hand, to represent the extraordinary nature of the divine judgment as such, xix. 24, ff. But it is this very circumstance that exhibits the writer's pure love of truth, which in fact does not consist in producing a hollow and defective hypothesis, but in acknowledging, as the conscientious enquirer must even now do, that "this region still remains full of wonders." (Ritter, p. 342.). Such also is the case with the fact mentioned in xix. 26, which is frequently pointed out as a strange one. The simple idea of the writer in this matter, as Vater i. p. 219, reminds us, is that Lot's wife became that which the whole district became, a pillar of salt, of which there are very many to be found in this region. Here also the natural side of the matter is closely connected with the higher ethical object, the transgression of the divine command and the punishment following upon that: a metamorphosis such as belongs to heathen fiction and fancy, can as little be imagined in such a connection as a real metamorphosis of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel iv. (see against that *my* Comment. p. 125, ff.). For it is just to these circumstances, that accompany the fact (which is certainly communicated with genuine antique pregnant brevity, comp. the very similar passage 1 Sam. xxv. 37), that close regard must neces-

[1] That this involves no contradiction of the statement xiii. 10 (Von Bohlen, p. 204) is sufficiently proved by similar asphaltic districts (comp. Michaelis, l. c. § xiv. sq.), and is also quite agreeable to the nature of the country; see Clericus, l. c. p. 363, sq.

sarily be paid in both cases; as in the one case to the nature of the madness, so in the present case to the peculiar character of the devastation; and thus the fact is entirely divested of that colouring of the magical, accidental, arbitrary and unaccountable, which is the characteristic mark of popular fable (according to which view *e. g.* Ovid treats the mythus).[1] The comparison of this narrative with the heathen tales of Niobe, &c., should therefore be regarded as by no means admissible; and we are thus also at the same time freed from all those hermeneutically incorrect interpretations, by which this passage has been defaced in very abundant measure.

Our author likewise has made Abraham offer to the Lord an intercession for the cities, which had fallen under the vengeance of Jehovah, xviii. 23, ff. The moving tenderness, which is exhibited in this conversation of the patriarch approaching his God with genuine childlike confidence, could not be represented, except from an entire ignorance of the nature of faith and prayer, as resting on "unworthy, defective, and childish notions of the Deity" (so Hartmann, c. p. 414),[2] or with blasphemous rudeness reproached as "a haggling with Jehovah, an indication of the later Jewish character" (so Von Bohlen, p. 208.). But even those who remain strangers to the deep religious element of this section, must yet acknowledge at least, what tenderness is here expressed, what deep compassion for the people who were sunk in sins. Shall we say now that the same "poet" is the author of (xix. 38, ff.) that "fiction of a very tasteless and odious kind" (De Wette, p. 94), for the immoral tendency of which our critics cannot find sufficiently strong expressions (Hartmann, p. 268, 417. Von Bohlen, p. 215, ff.). Here the unnaturalness and senselessness of the mythical view are very clearly displayed! What a perverted psychological view, to attribute to the same author two kinds of sentiment so directly opposed to each other, as this deep compassion for Sodom, and that embittered hatred to

[1] Comp. Baur, Symb. und Mythol. i. p. 58, ff. See also Pareau, de myth. interp. p. 301, sq.

[2] The God who is "the Judge of the whole earth," Gen. xviii. 25, but at the same time does not scorn to listen, full of compassion, to the prayer of his servant—that is the God of Abraham, the same God, who, having become man in Christ, will judge the living and the dead. There is not a more exalted idea that can absorb the human spirit, than this only true and living God of Abraham and of the Gospel. But the wretched idol that our critics are accustomed to represent as their ideal, is in the most proper sense a—*childish* notion, an empty imagination.

Moab and Ammon! He, who should suffer himself to be influenced at one time, in an account following so closely on the other, by bitter national hatred, and at another by the most profound pity, remains from such inconsistency a psychological riddle to us, the solution of which our opponents with blameable carelessness hurry over. Farther, what a strange fabrication the tale would be, if its author intended by it to throw deep disgrace on those nations, induced by mere national interest, since yet in the person of Lot he makes them related to the same stock as the Hebrews. We do not find it to be here, as Hartmann says (p. 417), that "the form of Lot, as a renowned collateral shoot of the consecrated family of Abraham, has the same enchanting splendour thrown around it, as encircles the head of the patriarch himself (sic!)" we rather think that the supposed poet has here been guilty of a new inconsistency; for why did he not rather deny every such disgraceful relationship for his own nation? He must still however be a *poet*, and no lack shall be permitted of fabrications and arbitrary treatment! Farther, this legend must belong to the times, when "the animosity of the Hebrews was carried to its height, and their hatred was inextinguishable," the later age of Josiah (Von Bohlen, p. 216.). As proof of this, the predictions of the prophets against those nations are adduced. The prophets certainly, in the name and by the commission of their God, denounce calamity and punishment to those nations. But the same Isaiah, who utters the woe concerning Moab, says with deep feeling: "my heart crieth out for Moab" (xv 5); he weeps and waters with his tears the cities of Moab (xvi. 9, 10), his heart is moved like a harp for the fate of Moab (xvi. 11); and Jeremiah expresses like emotions, xlviii. 36, 39. Is that also national hatred? It is just the opposite of all personal or merely national revenge that is displayed in such language: it is such a genuine pure love, as victoriously scorns those accusations. And will one ascribe to this the most odious legends, as pure fabrications, *i. e.* mendacious calumnies? "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig-tree bear olives, or a vine figs?" We have next necessarily to connect with this narrative the passage, Deut. ii. 9, 19, where it is said that Israel should have no inheritance of the country of the Moabites and Ammonites, because their territory was assigned them as the descendants of Lot. This passage, as well as that in Deut. xxiii.

4 (comp. v. 1, and Levit. xviii), evidently has a reference to the present, and we find accordingly that, in the Mosaic age, this circumstance had an important influence on the conduct of the Israelites. It is strange that Von Bohlen (p. 217) should say, that this was dictated by fear; for it is just a later age, which had seen these nations conquered and made tributary by Israel, that could least be afraid of them: indeed, that passage can be comprehended only as being committed to writing in the Mosaic age, and under the circumstances mentioned in the Pentateuch. The motive there adduced must consequently be the correct one; and then we have a memorable testimony of the lively influence, which the information given in Genesis still actually exercised in the time of Moses. How shall we explain that circumstance? Let it be granted that the Mosaic age had a peculiar interest in the preservation and recording of this narrative; yet the mode, in which this interest is expressed, testifies only to the truth of our narrative. Finally, however zealously the etymological definition of the names Moab and Ammon, given in Genesis, may be disputed,[1] it is yet surprising that none of all our recent critics has brought forward a single etymology, which they have ventured to substitute for the Bible one. Concerning עַמּוֹן Gesenius himself says, that the explanation בֶּן־עַמִּי is not contrary to analogy (Lehrgeb. p. 513), and this concession confirms at the same time the other etymology. For that מוֹאָב is compounded of מִן and אָב, and that the former is an old and more obscure expression, still retained in the *nomen proprium*, for מֵאָב (xix. 36), ought certainly not to surprise us (Ewald. Gr. p. 215, sec. ed.). In what other way, then, we may here confidently ask, shall the singular names of these two tribes be explained? If our etymology, be correct and the proof sufficient, so also is the narrative which is closely connected with it; and let one henceforth beware, as long as nothing better than the Scripture statement can be brought forward, of reproaching it with being a "tasteless imposture," as Hartmann does, p. 269, otherwise the harsh censure will fall back on him who makes it.[2]

[1] "The names Moab and Ammon are wretchedly twisted, to bring them into connection with this nasty fiction," says De Wette, p. 95.

[2] Rosenmüller says, without prejudice, Alterthumsk. 3. p. 38: "There is nothing in the affair itself, as it is told, which is not correspondent with the circumstances of that time, as well as with the way of thinking and acting in remote antiquity." There is therefore no sufficient reason for supposing it to be a fiction.

We have already made some general remarks on the fact mentioned in ch. xx.; we would here direct our attention only to some special objections. The first relates chiefly to the great age of Sarah, which does not agree with the beauty for which she is here renowned. Little is gained as to this point, if with several expositors we suppose that this occurrence took place at an earlier period of Abraham's history, immediately after his journey to Egypt. Even then Sarah is made sixty years of age. The natural grounds of explanation adduced here by many are as far from being satisfactory. "Ceterum neque eæ—is Heidegger's excellent remark on this, ii. 97—sufficiunt, cùm Saræ formam supra communem multarum aliarum fœminarum formam non extollant." He therefore justly adopts the remark previously made by Calvin: "insolitâ Dei gratiâ excelluit Saræ venustas inter alias ejus dotes." But along with this we by no means overlook the circumstance, that the fact has also a point of connection with what is natural. "The difficulties attending the age of Sarah, says Ewald, Kompos. d. Genesis, p. 230, may be removed by similar examples, one of which is supplied by the Travels of Björnstahl, Th. v. p. 78." We have also a case quite analogous to this in Dan. i. 15, where it is as foolish as here to believe that medicinal or physical considerations *alone* explain the whole, and to overlook the higher assistance, the overruling management of the Lord, who is and remains with his people in a wonderful manner in his promises.—Still less to the point is the objection drawn from xx. 18, that the circumstance there recorded of the unfruitfulness of the women, cannot have been remarkable during the short stay of Sarah with Abimelech. But what hinders us from assigning to Sarah's stay the duration of some months, which completely nullifies the objection? Farther, the excellent remark of Musculus applies here: "Poena quam Dominus domui Abimelech inflixerat, erat omnium convenientissima. Quid enim convenientius esse poterit, quam ut amittat, qui ad se rapit aliena?" in addition to which we must also take into consideration the view which prevailed in ancient times with regard to this matter, barrenness being regarded as one of the greatest curses (Hesiod. Op. et D. 240, sq.).—The appellation of Abraham as a *Nabi* is said also to point to a later period, as well as the representation of the peculiar efficacy of the prayer of a Prophet (Von Bohlen, p. 221. Hartmann, p. 718.). But, as relates to the for-

mer assertion, we have seen (General Introd. to O. T. § 11) that *Nabi* was the proper name given to the office by the theocratic legislation, and that the passage 1 Sam. ix. 9 treats only of the restoration of this earlier-sanctioned appellation. But the second has, if possible, still less foundation. We need not here once more reproach our opponents with entirely setting aside the *truth* as such which is expressed in the passage; and as the nature of it, which has a deep foundation in revelation, quite escapes them, falling out with the truth itself altogether, so that they are constrained by consistency to look upon the most express declarations of our Lord (as in Matt. vii. 7, ff.), and of the apostles (as James v. 16), as containing superstitious ideas. But even their own admissions, that the view of "the miraculous hearing of prayer" pervades the whole Old Testament, testifies here sufficiently against them, as, *e. g.*, a glance at the section on "External Usages" in Gramberg, Gesch. d. Rel. Id. i. p. 323, ff., is enough to show. This learned man, *e. g.*, remarks on the book of Judges: "Thus there prevails here also the same superstitious belief in the hearing of prayer presented by persons favoured by Jehovah, as we have remarked in the poets of Genesis and Exodus." Considering this internal contradiction, we may dispense with pointing out more exactly how that which was here announced in a divine vision might find, and must have found, its confirmation in the heathen conscience of Abimelech, and what high significance prayer in general is here shown to have had to those of more thoughtful minds, so that the language occurring here may be called a very appropriate appeal to the heart and conscience of the heathen king.

It is adduced as the main reason against the truth of the history in ch. xxi. 1–21, that Ishmael,[1] who must then have been at least fifteen years old, is introduced as a little child still carried by his mother. (Schumann, p. 317, 321. Von Bohlen, p. 224.). But this latter assertion, however confidently put forward, is decidedly incorrect. It should, in the first place, strike us as singular, that according to that assertion the section is made to contradict itself in the directest manner. In verse 9, an act is evidently ascribed to Ishmael in his mocking Isaac, which is plainly inconceivable on the part of a child "three years old." How absurd to suppose, that the narrator should immediately have quite forgotten this, with a thoughtlessness

[1 In the German it is "Isaac," which is manifestly an erratum.—Tr.]

that is hardly intelligible! The explanation of verse 14, as if Abraham had laid the leathern bottle of water *along with* the boy on Hagar's shoulders, is manifestly incapable of proof; for the words שָׂם עַל שִׁכְמָהּ necessarily refer only to the preceding חֲמַת מַיִם, and to וְאֶת הַיֶּלֶד belongs only the general notion וַיִּתֵּן *tradidit*, and we cannot see that this construction is exposed to the slightest objection. Verse 15 is translated: "she *laid* the lad under one of the bushes." But is that really the meaning of וַתַּשְׁלֵךְ, when it is said of persons? It rather signifies: *dimittere, demittere* in the wider sense; comp. *e. g.* Jerem. xxxviii. 6. Besides, we have complete evidence here in proof of the opposite of that assertion, in the expression—"take the lad and hold him by the hand," verse 18, which Clericus rightly explains: "pergas manu eum sustentare."

It is made to tell particularly against xxi. 22–34, that the same Abimelech, who is here introduced with his captain Phicol, appears again long afterwards in the history of Isaac, ch. xxvi. 26, ff., which is incredible (Schumann, p. 317.[1] comp. Von Bohlen, p. 226);—as if from this reference a chronologically exact calculation by means of definite statements concerning the age of Abimelech, &c., were so much as possible. Between the two occurrences there lies an interval of perhaps seventy years. Thus the same persons may very suitably appear in both, as is clear also from the character of this narrative (see on this subseq.).

If we now cast a look back on ch. xx. and xxi., we shall remark as a characteristic trait in them, the way and manner in which the Philistine king is there introduced as speaking and acting. In his case there is presupposed, as even Von Bohlen p. 220, observes, a purer veneration of God, of which subsequently we find no farther trace. This circumstance is so far worthy of note, as it agrees in general with the course of the historical development of those nations. We meet here with a fear of God and a recognition of the wonderful operation of his favour (comp especially xxi. 22), which transports us altogether into a better early period of this people's history. Accordingly along with the exhibition of a Sodom and Gomorrah, our author allows us to have a glance of the remnants of purer tribes which had remained free from such grosser and

[1] "Hæc omnia non poteris explicare nisi mythi, varia ratione tractati naturam contueris, neque desideras nostræ ætatis disciplinam historicam," says this learned man.

deeper immersion in sin. This shows how faithful must be the picture given us of that age; at least no author could invent such things who saw around him an entirely altered scene. In addition to this we have here two usages that are in the highest degree worthy of notice. The peculiar kind of oath which Abraham and Abimelech mutually swear to one another, xxi. 28, ff., never occurs again in Old Testament history; but that the custom existed in the primitive Hebrew times, is shown by the word נִשְׁבַּע, which had early passed into the language, and which would be inexplicable[1] without the existence of such a custom. Now how came the author to make this statement, which is here evidently mentioned only by the way? How came he to the knowledge of this peculiar usage, so as to make Abraham select *seven* lambs (Herodotus l. c. speaks of *seven* stones)? Just as in the case mentioned of Abraham's planting tamarisks in Beersheba and calling there on the name of Jehovah, xxi. 33, so in the present case it is evidently a pre-theocratic usage we have before us, which (as it afterwards might easily have seduced to idolatry) was rejected by the law and the prophets as an idolatrous symbol of worship; but that religious observances of this kind prevailed in primitive times is testified by many passages in the classics,[2] and while this notice is thus historically justified, it is an evidence at the same time that it could not possibly have been derived from subsequent invention, limited by the conditions of the Mosaic code.

Does the narrative in xxii. 1—19 contain traces of its high antiquity, or does it afford evidence that it is the production of a later attempt founded on legends? This involves a more exact definition of the entire meaning and purpose of it, and according to the different ways of apprehending this, have different critical decisions been pronounced. The narrative has in the first place a subjective side referring to Abraham. In yielding unconditional obedience to the divine command as such, without doubt or murmuring, he performs an act of that faith, which was counted to him for righteousness; the effects of divine grace, verified in a glorious and triumphant manner, are manifested in him. Viewed in this subjective aspect, the fact occupies an important place in the history;

[1] Something similar was found among the old Arabians,-Herod. iii. 8. Köster, Erläut. ff. p. 154 ff.

[2] v. Dougtaei. Anal. S. p. 24, sq. Winer, Realw. i. p. 609, 534.

but this by no means brings us yet to a complete insight into the nature of it. Why is it just this sacrifice that is demanded of Abraham? Why is it just this place that is significantly pointed out to him for offering it? Why is the sacrifice prevented and altered just in this way? Why is so solemn a renewal of earlier promises connected with this act? Only so far as we succeed in comprehending this objective side of the history in its totality does the true understanding of it become possible. According to a certain view, indeed, we are immediately transported to a mythical standing-point by the expression, "God tried Abraham."[1] The view then attributed here to the original is certainly a very "narrow" one, but it is one not indicated by a single word in it, but purely invented. The idea of divine trial here presented is, on the contrary, quite the same as is found in the whole of the Scriptures, representing it as a means to strengthen faith and consequently as a divine benefit, since it is the Lord, who does not try us beyond our strength and gives us the victory (comp. Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 432, ff.).[2] From this correct, because Scriptural point of view, no other question can arise but this, How the offering up of his son could be required of Abraham? This circumstance has frequently been employed for the purpose of proving that there is here a reference made to the savage custom of the inhabitants of Palestine of offering their children to idols, which (it is asserted) was also at an earlier period in use among the Hebrews.[3] Recent inquirers, however, have inclined against their will to the more correct point of view, by giving prominence to the theocratic view of the *first-born*[4]—for Jephthah's offering does not belong here—and stating that as the point of support for their view, without however recognizing the deeper reason of human sacrifices in general. In these we see man's consciousness of guilt on the one hand expressing itself in the most violent manner, and displaying its irrepressible impulse towards the atonement of sin, and on the other hand falling into the frightful perversion of the substitution for the guilty of associates in guilt: human sacrifice must conse-

1 In this there is found "the narrow view, that the Omniscient must first convince himself by a special proof of the faithful attachment of Abraham." Hartmann, p. 420.

2 [On Matt. vi. 13.]

3 Thus the English Deists, against whom see Warburton, Legation of Moses, iii. p. 342, ff.

4 Comp. *e. g.* Von Bohlen, p. cv. 230, ff. Vatke, l. c. p. 275, ff.

quently mark the fullest expression of the surrender of the individual will [*lit.* of the I] to the Deity. This class of sacrifices therefore has its deeper internal reason founded in the nature of man, and only by this can we explain the fact of their existence among all the known nations of antiquity (Baur, Symb. ii. 2, p. 293, ff.). Hence the full recognition of what truth there is in that idea, is to be found only in the theocratic institution, while its proper reference is to be discovered only in this passage: Israel is the property of Jehovah in the highest sense of the expression, and therefore the first-born as the representative of the whole people is specially his; and that also is his which he appointed to be consecrated to him as the substitute for the first-born, namely, the Levites and the institution of sacrifices. It is, therefore, firmly established as a fundamental principle in the Mosaic code, that the first-born is consecrated to Jehovah (Ex. xiii. 2, xxii. 28); and in the history of Abraham it is only the same fundamental thought that again makes a prominent appearance, expressed there with the same truth. Jehovah having entered into a real covenant-relation with the patriarch, this idea could not be wanting, as it takes the lead in the subsequent theocratic legislation. Then also the substitution of the animal victim in the place of the son is put in the right light; for this adoption by God of the imperfect instead of the perfect is precisely the peculiar meaning of the Mosaic system. In the history of Abraham, therefore, we behold a preparation for the Law, (which is exhibited in it in its principle), carried out in a genuine historical form: we have here represented in its commencement,—to which the subsequent institution is related as the farther development—the arrangement afterwards established among Abraham's posterity.[1] We find ourselves here quite in the pre-Mosaic state of things. On a closer examination of the place, we are confirmed in regarding this as being the just view; for, taken apart from what follows at a later period, everything here is mysterious and dark.

1 On the other hand our opponents can make nothing out of the narrative, which is best shown by the makeshift of supposing a more ancient narrative, according to which Abraham really sacrifices his son, &c. See V. Bohlen. But it is only in the manner stated above that the substitution of the ram receives its proper sense; and thus the parallels of Iphigenia, Theseus, &c.—as signifying the mitigation of earlier barbarity by later *humanity* (see Baur, p. 194)—fail, presenting only so far a general analogy, as they also express the impossibility of the perfect realization of the idea that demanded human sacrifices.

Abraham must journey into the *land of Moriah;* this never appears again in the history; Jehovah will there show him a *mountain*, which he calls *God seeth*[1]—(יהוה יראה): the memorial of the event is still maintained as a proverb in the mouth of Israel (xxii. 14.). Moses also knows the mountain of Israel's inheritance (Ex. xv. 17), and gives the people a prophetic promise of it as the place of the sanctuary. The order is given to David that the Temple should stand there (1 Chron. xxii. 18, ff.), in a way that necessarily presupposes a memorable distinction as attaching to it, and shews it to be no other than this same one, 2 Chron. iii. 1. Thus we find the narrative of Genesis to be fully accordant with the object of the whole section: we find the reference to the future sacrificial ritual conjoined with that to the locality where it should afterwards be established in its glory; and farther, the following history becomes an enigma to us, if we set aside the supposition that such an occurrence as this preceded. But every thing here that gives a symbolic indication of the future is so completely true to its enigmatical character, that to us without the subsequent fulfilment it would be obscure, while to Abraham it must have remained devoid of meaning, had there not been joined with it the divine promise, xxii. 15, ff., unveiling its meaning as to the general outlines of it, which must also have placed the patriarch in the right position for a general survey of the future; while the separate details did not receive their right significance until the time of the fulfilment.

We must accordingly regard that view as a completely perverted one, which seeks to find in the reference to the mountain Moriah, a proof that the passage was not written earlier than the age of Solomon.[2] Supposing we had here such a late mythus originating in the object of explaining the etymology of the name *Moriah*, it would, as Bleek has well shown, (Stud. u. Kritik. 1831, p. 520, ff.), in the first place be impossible to see how the author should have employed that name for his object, and not the subsequently common name of *Zion;* and in the second place, how he should speak here, instead of a *mountain* Moriah, of a *Land* of that name; and farther, he gives no etymology of the name Moriah, but calls the

1 [The writer should have said "*Jehovah* seeth;" the theocratic name of God is of special importance here.—Tr.]

2 Comp. *e. g.* De Wette, p. 100. Gesenius de Pent. Sam. p. 30. Hartmann, p. 420. Schumann, p. 326. Von Bohlen, p. 232.

mountain, in allusion to ver. 8, יהוה יראה. In addition, it cannot be explained how a later writer from pure invention should have succeeded in giving the narrative its remarkably simple, and at the same time deeply significant character, which quite transports us to a primitive age, from which we survey the future according to so peculiar a conception of it. It is precisely here that we should find the most unnatural supposition demanded of us. On the other hand, we cannot assent to Bleek in his conjecture, that it was not the name *Moriah* that stood here originally, but another, such as מוֹרֶה. This is not only an arbitrary connection, and unsuited to the evident object of the passage as developed by us; but it is also decidedly contradicted by 2 Chron. iii. 1, which passage certainly proves[1] our reading to be more ancient then the Samaritan-Alexandrian. And what is there strange or surprising in the circumstance, that the ancient name of the district was afterwards transferred to the mountain exclusively, the latter having acquired a special importance, both from this ancient occurrence, and also from the building of the Temple upon it, while the name of the district naturally disappeared? That Moriah besides was regarded as a part of the (higher) hill of Zion, and comprehended under its designation, is very clearly proved by Isaiah xxxi. 4, (see Reland, Pal. p. 854.)

This fact receives a striking confirmation from that which Sanchoniathon mentions concerning Kronos, whom the Phœnicians named Israel, that in a season of peril he sacrificed his only son (Euseb. præp. evang. i. 10.). The adduction of this evidently has a reference to the old custom mentioned a little before by the same writer (ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς), of presenting one's dearest child as a sin-offering in dangerous emergencies (λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι); being intended as a kind of historical justification or foundation for the custom. This was a mystic sacrifice (κατεσφάττοντο οἱ διδόμενοι μυστικῶς), that is, in imitation of the sacrifice which had been presented by a God, from whom it had its institution and received its higher sanction (Münter, Rel. d. Karth. p. 26.). In connection with this it must not be overlooked, that it is to Kronos also that circumcision is traced in Sanchoniathon; and thus we have here a very early corruption of this fact in primitive Hebrew history, and

1 Since it was certainly not written without intention or without reference to Genesis.

an interweaving of it with heathen worship. This very circumstance gives at the same time to Sanchoniathon's statement the stamp of authenticity, which it otherwise clearly bears; and it was not till a later age that, in order to justify that kind of sacrifice, it was represented as having a reference to the course of the sun (see Münter, p. 18.).

Chap. xxii. 20—24 contains a genealogy of the family of Nahor. In general, the invention of genealogies must appear an incomprehensible undertaking, since the author might have employed here a much simpler means of showing that Isaac married in his own family. But the history itself here sufficiently precludes every such suspicion by the simple remark, "it was told to Abraham," so that we here know exactly what support the information had, namely, a statement communicated to the Patriarch. The information then had been preserved in the family, whose history here occupies the writer; it is traced back to them as its source; would it be possible for one to state his sources with less prepossession and pretence? Von Bohlen, however, represents this genealogy also as invented. (*a*) "There are exactly twelve sons given, as in the case of Jacob; a contrived symmetry, the intentional character of which cannot be mistaken," (p. 236.). But "the intentional character" is here far from being obvious. What particular interest should our author have had in equalising the number of Jacob's twelve sons with that of Nahor's sons? Nothing is easier than at once to deduce from such a correspondence, this "intentional character;" but this in fact is not enough; for it remains a thing inconceivable, *what* intention the narrator should have connected with it? The reply to this question assumes quite a different position, if we connect with it the notice that has just been taken of the Abrahamitic tradition that is indicated here. It may then admit of easy explanation how the round number of twelve, associated with a well-known parallel case, and easily retained by the memory, was employed to hand down to posterity the most important of Nahor's sons. Yet we cannot positively decide that Nahor did not actually have just that number of sons, since similar cases of that kind may so often be repeated in the course of history, and we should then be justified in throwing suspicion on a multitude of the most authentic facts, charging them with an arbitrary symmetrical conformity. Still the former supposition appears to us the more natural. (*b*) "Besides

(continues Von Bohlen), it is only some of the names that are known, and for the most part they have been put down at random." A strange argument! So then, because in the later books we do not again meet with the names of these persons (NB. as proper *families*), the narrator has here fictitiously invented them. If the later books are not acquainted with this matter, and cannot give information of it, that is surely a proof, that we have here before us an earlier record, which is familiar with those circumstances. That the Uz here mentioned is different from the one spoken of in x. 23, is evident; and the very circumstance that in xxxvi. 28, we meet with a still later Uz among the descendants of Edom is a proof, not against, but for the credibility of our document. Later writers are acquainted with only *one* district of this name;[1] consequently from that standing-point only one Uz could have been mentioned here: thus our account here of itself goes farther back than that period, which will by no means afford us a key to the understanding of it. Von Bohlen, however, conjectures that *Buz*, which should certainly be sought for in the neighbourhood of *Uz*, is taken from Jerem. xxv. 23, but contradicts himself by subjoining the remark: "who (Jeremiah) connects the name with Dedan and Tema." How then do these come to be wanting here? This throws as little light on the origin of the genealogy as the following name *Kesed*, which, it is affirmed, shows that the narrator "suddenly passes to Mesopotamia:" how then did he happen to take that direction, if he proceeded simply from the suggestion of later circumstances? It is silly to say that the remaining names must have been borrowed from statements that bear an entirely different character, simply because they are found elsewhere—where they appear also in connection with other names of a different kind, as Shephatiah (1 Chron. xxvii. 16) and Shiphtan (Num. xxxiv. 24); particularly as we have a remarkable historical confirmation of something here, namely, that Maachah is mentioned in Deut. iii. 11 as a Syrian people and country (see Rosenm. Alterthumsk. i. 2, p. 251, ff.). We regard our record, therefore, as reaching back so far that we find it possible to explain it only by supposing it to contain information of a higher antiquity than any other can equal.

Ch. xxiii. is a document of especial importance in relation to our

1 Job i. 1; Jerem. xxv. 20; Lament. iv. 21; comp. Rosenmüller, Prolegg. ad Job. p. 26, sq.

object. There are individual traits in it that confirm the truth of the narrative. Of these a very marked one is the mode in which the social constitution of the Canaanites is here represented (comp. ch. xxxiv.); the transference of the possession of the cave of Machpelah could be accomplished only in the presence and with the concurrence of the Hittites, to which circumstance, therefore, the historian gives particular prominence (ver. 10, 13, 16, 18, 20.). When we observe farther that special stress is laid on "those that went in at the gate of the city," we have principally to think of persons of consideration, the elders and magistrates, who, according to the manner of the East, are accustomed to assemble on public occasions. No farther notice is taken in the Old Testament of this political constitution; we only know concerning the Phœnicians from other accounts, that their monarchical form of government was limited, and that they had assemblies of council (Heeren, Ideen i. 2, pp. 20, 21.). Our account thus shows an intimate acquaintance with the circumstances of the Canaanites. Besides, the mode of contracting the bargain as here described, how suitable to a people like the Canaanites! "In Mesopotamia, where there are no Canaanites carrying on trade, silver and gold are of rare occurrence, even in the time of Jacob: everything is procured by barter.—On the contrary in Canaan, in the neighbourhood of the Phœnicians, who had the trade of the world in their hands, even so early as Abraham's time barter is no longer practised, but silver is employed as *pretium eminens*, not, however, in the form of coined pieces, but by weight, xxiii. 16." Eichhorn, iii. p. 155. How suitable, accordingly, does the discourse attributed to Ephron xxiii. 15 appear in his mouth, and how striking the expression כסף עבר לסחר in ver. 16! But we are especially struck with the precise, solemn manner of this purchase, which is described with a circumstantiality that can be explained only by our possessing here a document transmitted to us by a faithful hand. At any rate we learn from it what importance was attached to this fundamental possession. Now, when De Wette says (p. 105) that it could not be till a subsequent period that the need could be felt of rescuing such transactions from uncertain tradition, and perpetuating them in writing; we ask him, at what epoch chiefly must we suppose this need to have been experienced? The purchase of the cave of Machpelah, he says, had an especial interest to the Hebrews: it was a verification of the

Hebrews' right of possession to Canaan. Certainly : but *when* was the desire to get that right acknowledged, or when must it have been, greatest and most pressing?—at the period when their taking possession of the land was agitated, or when the actual possession of it had long been enjoyed? Still, however, that does not explain the importance attributed to this burial place; no farther mention is anywhere made of it in the post-Mosaic history; but it is of the greatest consequence in the patriarchal and Mosaic history (Gen. xxv. 9, 10, xlix. 29—32, l. 12, 13; Exod. xiii. 19.). We are in this way placed at the same time in the right point of view for forming a judgment of our history. It does not mean to give what would be properly an apologetic justification of that claim to Canaan, the deeper reason of which lies in the divine counsel and promise; and we have here only Abraham's appropriation of these —his faithful fulfilment of the will of God as revealed to him; and accordingly a practical seal attached by Jehovah to his promises by means of his servant. The monument was a permanent sacred possession, as De Wette remarks, and the memorial it presented was partly such as could very easily be preserved, and partly must have been an external representation to the people of the plainest kind, as to what was the will of Jehovah in reference to Israel's taking possession of Canaan. We may say with perfect justice, that the paragraph is unintelligible, on the supposition that it is not the composition of Moses.

Ch. xxiv. Here our opponents themselves confess, "one might be tempted to take the narrative in the historical sense" (De Wette, p. 113.). Here we meet also with many ancient customs, such as the peculiar form of benediction, ver. 60 (comp. Ruth iv. 11, 12), but especially the mode of taking an oath by putting the hand under the thigh (comp. xlvii. 29), ver. 2, 9, to which nothing analogous is found or could be found afterwards (see Winer, Realwörterbuch, p. 359.). How any one could conceive of this latter trait, which has not been explained by any real parallel, as invention, is quite an enigma; how can it even be imagined that the author should intentionally have interwoven in his account a trait like that, to give a kind of confirmation to it?

It is precisely those circumstances, which have been charged with improbability, that form here the warrant for the full authenticity of the account. De Wette remarks especially on the confi-

dence of the servant, that Jehovah would procure the right damsel for him; and next, on the similarity of the tale to the history of Jacob, and on the circumstance that Rebekah immediately resolved to go with the slave. But how characteristic is it in the servant of Abraham, that he openly expresses his doubts (ver. 5); and then, when referred by Abraham's firm confidence in his God to His aid, obeys; expects a guiding sign from Jehovah (ver. 15), and even then is dumb with astonishment, waiting with anxious surmise as to whether Jehovah had really prospered his way or not (ver. 21); but when he sees the solicited omen fulfilled, appropriates it and executes his purpose! What a faithful, vivid picture! And must not the same circumstances that produced so deep and powerful an impression upon this slave, have produced the same in a still higher degree on the damsel who was especially interested in them, so that when even Laban and Bethuel were obliged to recognise the providence of Jehovah in Eliezer's narration (ver. 50), she also had no hesitation in submitting to the higher will which had thus made itself known? Who can fail to see in all this the simple-mindedness of ancient times depicted in the truest colours? The similarity to the history of Jacob (ch. xxix.) we do not perceive, since all the main circumstances are different, except the identity of the locality, and the meeting with the damsels at the well, which however arises out of the circumstances of the East itself, that being the place of general meeting for society, where betrothments are generally contracted, as Von Bohlen, p. 244, says.

De Wette next remarks on the religious tone that prevails among the personages introduced, the religious language of the slave, his praying to Jehovah, his kneeling down, and Laban's salutation and answer, in reference to all which he proceeds on the supposition, that Abraham's religious character must at all events be regarded as mythical. This assumption might be taken as having a measure of foundation, if it could be shown that the religious language (and so the religious ideas and convictions also) of all the persons was the same, which would be styled unhistorical. But we find just the opposite in this document, as the hesitation of the slave, already alluded to, and his whole behaviour prove. In his case we see throughout such a view, as is more objective in its nature, disclosing itself in its relation to the faith of Abraham: thus Abraham is obliged to give him a more exact definition of Jehovah as "the

God of heaven and earth" (ver. 3); while he prays constantly to Jehovah, "the God of his master Abraham," and speaks of him as such to Laban and Bethuel (ver. 33, ff.). Apart from the circumstance that we do not know how much knowledge of Jehovah, the God of Abraham, had been preserved in Nahor's family, Laban might very well, after what had previously happened, all of which had been reported by Rebecca (ver. 28), employ the address "blessed of Jehovah," even if we regarded him as occupying an entirely heathenish position. But to any one who can bring in question the expression (ver. 50), "the thing proceedeth from Jehovah," to him the best established facts of Bible history, the internal reason of which he fails to seize from want of a deeper psychological apprehension—we may instance Luke xxiii. 47—may appear inexplicable and therefore fabulous.

But it is said that the object of the narrative betrays itself as a national one, by the national feeling expressed in it, namely in opposition to marriage with Canaanitish women. This involves a double false supposition. In the first place, that it should be doubtful whether Abraham could be so decided against the marriage of his son with a Canaanitish woman (De Wette, p. 115), a doubt which is supported only by questioning the reality of the earlier part of the history of Abraham; so that one doubt is built upon another. But granting its reality, Abraham could not but have been opposed to sanctioning his son's connection by marriage with the Canaanities, since he possessed the most definite knowledge that the land should not belong to the inhabitants of Canaan, but to his own seed.[1] Hence he is equally decided in refusing his permission to Isaac's returning to his native land. Thus Abraham's procedure on this occasion is connected in the closest manner with the previous actions of his life, and this his faithful adherence to Jehovah's word and will exactly proves and seals the truthfulness and objective reality of the revelations and promises that had been made to him. Another unfounded supposition is, that marriage with the Canaanites did not become the subject of a

[1] "Quia sacro fœdere Deus ipsum a Cananæis diviserat, merito timet ne Isaac affinitate cum illis Dei jugum excutiat.—Et quamvis apud eos tranquille habitaverit ad tempus, non tamen sobolem habere potuit cum illis communem, quin confunderet quæ Dei mandato distincta erant. Ergo integer hac in separatione manere voluit, et suos servare integros."—CALVIN.

prohibition among the Hebrews until times much later than those of Moses. But not only do the Mosaic laws on this subject (Exod. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3) prove the contrary, but also the circumstance, that in the period immediately subsequent to that of Moses, we have indeed the transgression of that prohibition exhibited, but at the same time its destructive consequences are shown, while it is rebuked also with an evident reference to the Mosaic law, Judges iii. 6, ff

In ch. xxv. 1—4, 12—18, we find the genealogy of Arabian tribes and heads of tribes, descended from Abraham, partly by his marriage with Keturah, partly through Ishmael, his child by Hagar. The sons of Keturah are: Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak, and Shuah. It is only in Genesis that a distinction is made between the two tribes, of cognate appellations, *Medanim* and *Midianim*; which appear, however, to have been closely connected (comp. Gen. xxxvii. 28, 36), so that later authors have preserved only the one name. That book is here no less exact in making a distinction between the Ishmaelites and the Midianites. At a later period—so early as the time of Moses—the name Ishmaelite had, on account of the active traffic of these Arabian tribes, received the general signification of *Arabian merchants* (סחרים), which, in a wider sense, comprehends the Midianites also.[1] In like manner our author is acquainted with two tribes, Sheba and Dedan, derived from Jokshan, which are to be distinguished from Ham's descendants of the same name, ch. x. 7, and from Sheba, the son of Joktan, x. 28; so that thus Genesis makes mention of three distinct persons of the name of Sheba, and their three different genealogies.[2] That in these we have the same ancestor introduced, only with a different genealogy, is a conjecture utterly unfounded, which is refuted by the very circumstance that it is not applicable to Gen. x., where we should then find this diversity in the same chapter (comp. Rosenmüller, l. c. p. 34); and the mere similarity of names is far from being sufficient to support such an hypothesis. (Ranke, Untersuch. p. 255.). Our author mentions three tribes in verse 3 (the Ashurim, Letushim, and Leummim), which appear early to have become mingled with others, and thus to have lost their names

1 Comp. Genes. xxxvii. 25, 27, 28. Judges viii. 24. Ewald, Compos. d. Gen. p. 55. Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. iii. p. 23, 24.

2 As Vater i. p. 243, De Wette, p. 117, Gesenius, s. v. שְׁבָא, Von Bohlen, p. 125, are of opinion.

(Rosenm. p. 35): a plain sign that we have here to do with a document that displays the closest acquaintance with the hoariest antiquity.

Our document displays the same exactness in the statement it gives of the sons of Ishmael. There appear among them Nebayoth and Kedar, the Arabians whom Pliny (H. N. v. 12) designates *Cèdrei* and *Nabatæi*. The only other place in which these two appear united, is Is. lx. 7. Hitzig, however (on Isaiah p. 253), makes the just remark: "In the authors previous to the Exile, with the exception of Genesis, it is the Kedarenes exclusively that are mentioned, just as at a later period it is almost only the Nabateans—1 Macc. ix. 35, v. 25. Diod. Sic. 3, 42. 19, 94, ff."—so that here again we meet with the peculiarity by which Genesis is characterized. It is worthy of remark, what exact knowledge the author possesses of the original relations of the Ishmaelitish Arabians, especially of their original dodecarchical constitution, which has its analogy in similar institutions of other oriental nations.[1] Its analogy with the like division into tribes among the Israelites need not therefore surprise us,[2] especially when we consider that the author says that these twelve sons had become princes, heads of tribes, (xxv. 16 according to the prophecy xvi. 20); so that, taking this statement in its strict meaning, the supposition remains unconfuted, that Ishmael may have had other sons, who did not however attain to the rank of phylarchs. How shall we now explain this statement in any way as a piece of fiction? What kind of sufficient motive can we ascribe to the author, that should have led him to assign such a dodecarchy to the Ishmaelites? He certainly could not have deduced it from later circumstances connected with these tribes, which, as is necessarily the case with such nomadic nations, most probably soon assumed a different formation. The Hebrew monuments also maintain a profound silence on this point where they speak of the princes of Arabia (as Jerem. xxv. 24; Ezek. xxvii. 21): it is indeed scarcely to be supposed, that, considering the

1 Comp. Rosenmüller, A. u. N. Morgenl. iv. p. 345. The Egyptian Dodecarchy also rested on a like earlier division of names; Heeren, Id. ii. 2, p. 396. Seyffarth, de astron. Aeg. geographia, p. 90, sq. Leo, Univers. Gesch. i. p. 88. We meet with a similar case in Homer among the Phœnicians, Odyss. viii. 390, in ancient Attica, Thucyd. ii. 15. See Leo, l. c. p. 167; and among the Etruscans—see Müller, Etr. i. 344, ff.

2 De Wette, p. 117: "It excites suspicion to find Ishmael with twelve sons like Israel, who are the ancestors of the same number of tribes."

great dismemberment which these tribes underwent, they were all exactly known to them. Or shall we suppose that a great charm lay in representing Israel and Ishmael as being similarly divided into tribes? How does this comport with the imputation of national prejudice? Why then did he assign the Edomites quite a different constitution (ch. xxxvi.)? The only supposition then which is left for us is, that this record, owing to the time when it was written, was able to give an historical account of these circumstances, a conclusion to which we are also led by the names of those who are mentioned as heads of tribes, many of which occur nowhere else.

Ch. xxv. 19—34, which treats of the birth of Esau and Jacob, and the transference of the birthright from Esau to his brother, is likewise regarded by recent critics as "an entertaining popular tale." Let us examine it more closely. Rebecca is barren, but Isaac's prayer is heard by Jehovah; his wife is with child of twins, which struggle together in the womb, and Jehovah being enquired of respecting that circumstance, answers, that it is a pre-indication of the nations that should be descended from the two sons, and of their future discord. The first thing that is remarked as strange is, that Rebecca had recourse to Jehovah about so insignificant a matter.[1] But this is an opinion which agrees neither with the way of thinking that generally prevailed in ancient times,[2] nor with the particular condition of Rebecca. For we must conceive of her as having at any rate her attention directed through the proceedings of Jehovah, which certainly were not unknown to her, to the intentions of Abraham's God respecting her family; especially as she had just received a testimony in her husband's prayer having been heard, that Jehovah was with him and his seed. It is also clear from the expression employed (יִתְרֹצֲצוּ), that the movement of the children was an unusual and extraordinary one; and to the mind of antiquity nothing of that kind was without a meaning. Compare also the very similar fact Luke i. 41, ff. In like manner it is thought unsuitable that Rebecca should here "enquire of an oracle," and this is regarded as a mark of later times which were subject to Levitical influence.[3] Certainly the enquiry could not be made

1 "Any midwife would have satisfied Rebecca as to this struggling, and the motions of twins are not more surprising than those of a single child." De Wette, p. 118.

2 Comp. Apollodor. bibl. ii. 2, 1. Cic. de divin. i. 53.

3 "That this oracle is fictitious is manifest. At that time there was, generally speaking, no oracle as yet." De Wette comp. Hartmann p. 719, Von Bohlen p. 262.

after the mode of later times; especially not by the Urim and Thummim, and Von Bohlen supposes that this was the only means by which the Deity was enquired of. On the contrary comp. *e. g.* 2 Kings iii. 11, viii. 8, where the addition מאת נבא shows that there were several ways of enquiring of Jehovah. But the wider sense of the phrase דרשׁ את יהוה is also incontestably clear from Exod. xviii. 15, and still more decidedly from 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, where three methods of enquiring of God are enumerated, by Dreams, by Urim, and by Prophets (comp. Gen. Introd. to Old Testament, p. 57 § 11.). How can we then in this place avoid thinking of a dream, as the medium by which Rebecca received the divine answer, which suits very well, first, with the fact that such is the form of revelation which frequently occurs in Genesis, and which is thus, as it appears, peculiar to a primitive age (see chs. xv., xxviii., xxxvii., xl., xli., xlvi.; comp. Job. iv. 13, xxxiii. 15); and also, with the circumstance that that form is not connected with any later theocratic appointment; and farther, with the nature of the oracle given as communicated to Rebecca, which can hardly be imagined as communicated in any other way. It is farther asserted to be quite impossible that at his birth, Jacob should have laid hold of his brother's heel (De Wette, p. 118; Schumann, p. 381), although there is a multitude of similar surprising phenomena connected with births; but with respect to that, since our opponents bring forward no evidence to support their assertion, we satisfy ourselves by saying with Rosenmüller: "de quâ re judicium esto penes artis obstetriciae peritos." On the other hand, there is more importance in the charge of *falsity*, which is brought against the derivation of the names *Jacob, Esau, Edom.*[1] It is impossible to see what grammatical objections can be brought against these derivations; other and better etymologies are not adduced; and thus we find ourselves still obliged to fall back on Genesis. But that Esau should have received the surname of *Edom* from the occurrence specified is completely according to the mind and spirit of the East,[2]

[1] De Wette even speaks of the etymology as "silly," p. 119, comp. Von Bohlen. p. 259.

[2] The Arabians also are fond of giving surnames of that kind (see Willmet, Prolegg. ad Ant. Moall. p. 6) to famous persons. There is a great similarity to the present instance in the surname which Hodjr, king of the Kendites, received—Akil al Murar—owing to his wife in a passion saying, "He is like a camel that devours bushes." Abulf. Hist. Anteisl., p. 130, ed Fleischer. The exactness with which even modern oriental

and is the more natural, if we conceive of a reference (Hos. xii. 3) to the other remarkable fact [Jacob's birth] as being a current expression in the mouth of the people. It is just in this way that a permanent appellation arises out of individual traits of that kind.

But De Wette's chief reason is the following: "Even if the birthright had been an actual privilege, which one could transfer to another, and even if this transference could have been any advantage to Jacob, Esau could not have dared to barter it for the smoking dish of lentiles, and the father's sanction must have been required to confirm the bargain. And indeed we find no farther consequences arising out of this strange exchange, as the following myth (ch. xxvii.) shows, whose object and improbability are the same with this, so that the one tale confutes the other, and they both betray themselves as groundless fictions." That the first-born in the patriarchal age enjoyed peculiar privileges, is put beyond doubt by the importance which is everywhere attached to that distinction, and is plain also from the subsequent appointments of the Theocracy (Deut. xxi. 15—17.). In the present case, however, the right is shown to be quite an actual one by the divine oracle, which deprives the first-born of the right of being the chief head of his people. This circumstance of itself explains how Jacob endeavoured to obtain possession of these privileges by sinful means. It was God's decreed purpose that his promises should have their fulfilment in Jacob, and not in Esau: the personal character of Jacob also is such as shows him to have a special attachment to them, in contrast to Esau's mind, which is attached only to sensible things (xxv. 27.). This serves to explain sufficiently the conduct of both of them. The promises which God had connected with Isaac's first-born were, in their prevailing character, of a spiritual nature, and of these promises Jacob must be the recipient.[1] Esau cared little for them. The divine word was fulfilled in Jacob's case, in spite of his sin, not by means of it: a protracted series of troublous days is his punishment for it; but the calling of God in its nature and essence remains the same. "Quod si in re procurandâ infirmitas Jacobi admixta fuit, eo major fuit gratia Dei quod indulserit tam benigné, ut ostenderet totum id ab electione pendere, non ab operibus, quod

custom preserves such epithets, which to us seem even ridiculous and quite trivial, is shown for instance by the passage in Michaelis, Syr. Chrestom. p. 9, 11, ff.

[1] Vitringa speaks admirably on this point, Obss. s. 1, p. 287, sq.

unus alii præferretur" (Heidegger, ii. 245.). Thus this account is full of the deepest psychological truth; and it is only by entirely overlooking this that questions can be started as to how Esau could have done this or that? The point of view which the narrative itself presents, furnishes a sufficient explanation of the whole. But that ch. xxvii. is in perfect accordance with it will be shown by what follows.

The impossibility of explaining this narrative by the national hatred of the Jews (see especially Von Bohlen, p. 260, ff.), is proved by this character which it bears. If the narrator had been influenced by views of so external a nature, that he was concerned only for the vindication of the honour of his nation, he could not have represented its ancestor in such a light as this, which could not fail to be injurious to him. It is useless to maintain that the Hebrew writer had different moral sentiments and views from the ethical ideas of our age. In what other place, either in the whole of the Pentateuch, or in all the books of the Old Testament, do we find sin taken under protection? So far from this being the case, we have seen that this narrative is pervaded by what is truly the profoundest ethical principle, inasmuch as we see in it the mercy of God, and that alone, substituting the display of grace for the execution of justice; and in an ignorance of this truth we have just a most striking exhibition of the perverted ethical views connected with unbelief.[1] The narrative would otherwise stand, as to its ethical character, in strange conflict with itself, inexplicable either by hermeneutics or psychology. Indeed, if we conceive of the relation of the Hebrews to the Edomites, as it is legally established in the Pentateuch (Deut. ii. 5, 8, xxiii. 7), we can discern no trace of the hostile disposition referred to; on the contrary, the rules there prescribed are founded on the originally fraternal relation of the two nations. Thus, when considered also on this side, the present narrative is fully entitled to take its place at the very commencement both of Israel's and Edom's history; and it is only thus that we come to the complete understanding of it.

1 This explains such sentiments as that of De Wette: "The Greeks also have their crafty Ulysses, but how much nobler and more exalted is his form than that of Jacob here!" P. 128.

§ 20. CONTINUATION. GEN. XXVI.—XXXVIII.

We may with the greatest justice overlook the "confusion" that is attributed to the narrative in ch. xxvi., since the author of this charge himself appears to lay no great stress upon it.[1] But some weight must be assigned to the similarity which it bears to the occurrences in the life of Abraham, and to the new etymology that is given of the name Beersheba. But that similarity is what our author is quite aware of, as he makes express mention of it, and as the persons that are actors here are evidently introduced with a reference to what happened at an earlier period. Isaac employs the same means as his father for the protection of his wife. "At every place whither we shall come, say of me, He is my brother," is Abraham's language, xx. 13; a proof how much he reckoned on this resource. Consequently, Isaac believes himself obliged to employ the same means. It is likewise by no means Abimelech himself, now grown old, who desires Isaac's wife; it is rather "the people of the place;" but Abimelech is already acquainted with Isaac through Abraham, and knows that Jehovah is with this family. As relates, however, to the discrepancy of this narrative with the earlier one in xxi. 22, ff., mentioned by Von Bohlen, in respect of the origin of the name Beersheba, it has been already remarked (see Ranke, p. 225) that xxvi. 23 supposes the previous existence of this name, and that in verse 15 it is expressly stated that Isaac restored their old names to the wells which had been stopped up. Here also he forms a covenant by oath with Abimelech: he had thus a particular occasion to adopt the name as well as his father; both of them, as the record plainly indicates, met here with almost the same lot, and followed a similar course of conduct. (See Schumann, p. 394.). Von Bohlen then asserts, that the wealth for which the Patriarchs are here and elsewhere said to be famous, is a mere poetical embellishment. His reasons are: (*a*) the herds of Abraham and Isaac disappear in Jacob's case, like a Fata Morgana; a reason

1 Von Bohlen, p. 265, ff. Among these "lesser improbabilities" he reckons, *e. g.*, that of a herdsman dwelling in the royal residence of a settled people so near to the prince; forgetting that Abimelech also appears as a pastoral prince, and Isaac as a distinguished emir of his age;—Abimelech granting him his full protection (ver. 11), and presently *without reason* refusing him an abode (ver. 16); where the author appears not to have read ver. 15, &c.

deserving of no regard, since the cause of their disappearance is plainly accounted for in Genesis by circumstances, namely, the secret flight of Jacob. (*b*) Jacob again of a sudden becomes wealthy; where again we have an exact statement given us as to how he attained to these great possessions.—(*c*) But if the object of the tale required it, the fancy of the narrator could as willingly make an effort in the way of descent, as Joseph's history clearly shows; an argument, to which we shall afterwards return.

As relates to the wives of Esau (xxvi. 34), the statement continues to be charged, as by V. Bohlen (p. 273), with containing inexplicable contradictions, as compared with xxviii. 9 and xxxvi. 2. Esau first marries Judith, daughter of the Hittite Beeri, who in xxxvi. 2 is called the daughter of Anah, the daughter of the Hivite Zibeon,[1] and named Oholibamah, a change of name, which need the less surprise us, as the orientals in general frequently connect a change of name with a change in the relations of life, which is particularly the case with women.[2] Esau's second wife is Bashemath, Elon's daughter, a Hittitess, who, for the same reason, is called Adah in xxxvi. 2. The third wife is called, xxviii. 9, Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael, the sister of Nebayoth, and she is named Bashemath in xxxvi. 3. When we compare the many alterations of name which the age of the Patriarchs presents us with (Ranke, p. 247), so insignificant a difference will no longer surprise us.

The objections that may be urged against the history in ch. xxvii., have particular prominence given them by De Wette (p. 120, ff.). (1.) The blessing, says he, cannot have been viewed as being so objective a law, having actual force if it were but uttered; neither can it have been a testamentary disposition, for then Isaac might have retracted it. Granting that this view of Isaac's paternal blessing were the just one, it must still be admitted that it is unique of its kind, and throughout betrays no dependence on later ideas, but appears, on the contrary, in the highest degree peculiar and independent. But such a view is by no means that of the record. Jacob certainly acts a deceitful part (xxvii. 35): Isaac blesses him,

[1] Just as Djnah is called sometimes Leah's and sometimes Jacob's daughter. Ranke, p. 246.

[2] Comp. Rosenmüller, A. u. N. Morgenl. i. p. 63, and my own Commentary on Daniel, p. 30.

but, on coming to know what he has done, he is alarmed on account of it (ver. 33): he has bestowed the blessing contrary to the inclination of his heart. Unquestionably he must now have had the divine oracle recalled to his mind, which he himself had confirmed against his will. Must he not, looking but to this one circumstance, have felt a hesitation to withdraw the blessing? The paternal blessing had certainly great importance attached to it at that time (xlix. 26); should he now treat the important transaction as a mere sport of chance, and not rather pay regard to the higher divine determination in this event? He had intended to make the elder brother ruler over the younger; should he venture, in the express designation of the privilege of primogeniture, to go in opposition to the divine prediction, which was so definite? Such a case would, even in heathenish antiquity, have been thought very strange and surprising. Add to this, that Isaac knows that Esau has already transferred his right to Jacob (xxvii. 36); how then upon this new occurrence could he do otherwise than hesitate to sin against God's will by an obstinate adherence to his own? This completely explains the change of his feelings towards Jacob, xxviii. 1, ff. But we may now on our part ask, how we can here again admit the supposition that a later writer, influenced by the desire to glorify his own nation, should give such a portraiture of the two patriarchs, Isaac as well as Jacob? His object is manifestly a far higher one—to set forth the honour of Jehovah, the majestic display of which prevails here throughout; but the persons themselves are all the more brought before us in their entire human weakness and sinfulness; showing that the writer must be one who regards only the truth of history, without following any selfish aims. (2.) The benedictions, De Wette farther says, are evidently invented; the relation of the two nations is so plainly expressed in them (comp. 2 Sam. vi. 14, 2 Kings viii. 20), that we must assign this mythus to the period subsequent to Joram. But, if we apply this principle consistently, to what period shall we have to refer the predictions, in which it is announced to Abraham, that all nations should be blessed in him? The prediction here, however, is evidently a recapitulation of those made to Abraham: that theocratic blessings of a spiritual kind are also spoken of, is clear from the words, "cursed be those who curse thee, &c." xxvii. 29; so that the blessing given to Jacob em-

braces not merely a single fact in the history of Edom or Israel, but the whole theocratic history according to its internal nature and profoundest signification, by which Jerusalem is made the queen of all cities, and Canaan the head of all lands. Thus the declaration concerning Edom's fate contains a representation of the essential nature and character of the people, in which they resembled their founder, and in that also should lie their success, which should be merely of an external kind: "by thy sword shalt thou support thyself—and it shall come to pass, because thou art restless,[1] thou shalt shake off his yoke." Thus this prediction also has a universal character, and an individual fact in the history of this people appears only as a necessary consequence flowing from their radical tendencies. Regarding the prediction from this point of view, we must admit that it occupies here the most suitable position. (3.) The intrigue, says De Wette, is improbable: it is a very clumsy piece of masquerade. Granting the latter part of the assertion, the improbability of the circumstance by no means follows. The deception practised on the father appears so well accounted for, and his doubts are so little concealed, that none but the most arbitrary hypercriticism could attack this portion of the narrative. De Wette also contradicts himself: *e. g.* here he regards it as improbable, that Esau was rough, but at p. 118, on the contrary, he declares this to be a frequent peculiarity of red-haired men. (4.) "An etymology also is not wanting: יעקב is here derived from עקב." This derivation is one given previously; it is not a new etymology that is spoken of, but merely an allusion to the name *Jacob*: comp. *e. g.* 1 Sam. xxv. 25, where a similar paronomasia occurs.

Ch. xxviii. One incident in this narrative forms a sufficient pledge of its high antiquity; the erection of a stone as a sacred memorial (מַצֵּבָה), and the anointing of it (ver. 18.). No where else in the Old Testament do we find this usage countenanced; but the law prohibiting מצבות in general, as belonging to heathen worship (comp. Ex. xxiii. 24, xxxiv. 13; Lev. xxvi. 1; Deut. xii. 3, xvi. 22) confirmed the practice of employing the word מצבה, con-

1 Comp. with this the characteristic description of the disposition of the Edomitish people in Josephus De B. Jud. iv. 15: *θορυβῶδες καὶ ἄτακτον ἔθνος, ἀεί τε μετέωρον πρὸς τὰ κινήματα καὶ μεταβολαῖς χαῖρον, πρὸς ὀλίγην δὲ κολακείαν τῶν δεομένων τὰ ὅπλα κινοῦν καὶ καθάπερ εἰς ἑορτὴν εἰς τὰς παρατάξεις ἐπαγόμενον.*

stantly in a bad sense (Hos. iii. 4.). The custom itself, besides, receives its explanation from the heathen rite of the consecration of sacred stones, which, from being general in the East—as the name *Βαιτύλια* is of Semitic origin, and is certainly not found in the narrative by accident (בית-אל); comp. Sanchon. ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev. i. 10—spread thence into Greece.[1] With regard to the Hebrews, therefore, that sacred usage belongs entirely to the patriarchal age, which alone completely explains the freer character which it exhibits, in contrast to the necessary legal restrictions belonging to a later period, while it is impossible to conceive how a later age in general could come to attribute an act of that kind to the Patriarch, by which it would have been making him an idolater. Farther, we shall also find the name *Bethel* here employed to be quite appropriate, as one, which in this sense had already obtained a much more general reception. Thus we have no occasion to think of a peculiar etymological object, which in itself would be suspicious (De Wette, p. 124): on the contrary the name was already of so common occurrence, that it excludes the thought of laborious invention, and we shall see farther on, that xxxv. 1, ff. is in perfect harmony with it. It is besides to be remarked that the narrator here speaks of Jacob lighting only on a *place*, not on any *city*; yet he adds, that it was the situation of the city whose name had long been known in his time as Luz (ver. 19.). This gives us a remarkable glimpse of the time of the Patriarch, when the city Luz, which certainly lay in the neighbourhood of Bethel (taking that appellation in its narrower sense),[2] was not yet in existence; and of the time of the narrator, at which there was here the ancient Canaanitish city of Luz, which we meet with in this place in the age of Joshua; so that we are here led quite to the standing-point of the Mosaic composition of the book.

De Wette, however, is of opinion that the dream is too "beautifully ingenious," "clever," and "philosophical" to be attributed to Jacob, and not rather to a later Hebrew poet. But Von Bohlen, p. 283, on the contrary, regards the fiction as a purely sensuous one; and Hartmann, p. 430, calls the whole conception utterly unworthy. But we would only put this question, in the first place:

[1] Comp. *e.g.* Pausan. x. 24, 5: λίθος ἐστὶν οὐ μέγας (in Delphi) τούτου καὶ ἔλαιον ὀσημέραι καταχέουσι. Theophr. char. Eth. 17.

[2] See Josh. xvi. 2. Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. ii. 2. p. 140. Gesenius, Thes. p. 194.

Is the idea which undeniably lies at the foundation of it (see ver. 15), "behold I am *with thee*," &c., the intimate conjunction in which Jehovah stands with his own people, the race beloved and chosen by him, one that is foreign to Genesis; is it not rather the fundamental thought of this book, as is expressly declared in ver. 13? and secondly, Is the clothing of this idea, God's connection with the earth by means of his messengers (angels) novel, and foreign to what we discover in all the more ancient documents of the Hebrew faith? Here also we require only to inspect the present book, as well as all the books of the following period, to recognise the complete accordance of this passage with that belief which is common to them all. It is then incomprehensible how it should be objected to on this ground. Farther, it has been already shown that the whole of De Wette's view as to this being a mythus invented for giving distinction to Bethel, must be set aside as groundless.

Chs. xxix.—xxxi. Our record now informs us with a simple candour, which is an additional pledge of its historical truth, of the events that transpired during Jacob's abode in Mesopotamia. The author sketches for us the manners and mode of life of that age in such a way, as admits of no suspicion of his having added fictitious decorations. It would therefore be an undertaking of some difficulty to show why the narrator should represent Jacob as acquiring the possession of considerable wealth in this particular way. At first, indeed, Jacob's conduct strikes us as being somewhat surprising: ch. xxx. displays the prudential side of his character, and it is not till we come to ch. xxxi. that we are in a condition to estimate his conduct properly. But this never is the mode of narration pursued by an author, who is anxiously concerned about an apologetic object in what he writes. Our record gives an exact account of the means, involved in the nature of the thing, which Jacob employs, but as little is it silent concerning the active agency of God in the matter. It is only by taking both into account that the meaning of the narrative becomes quite clear to us: it is quite intelligible in its natural connexion (for the means employed by Jacob are by no means "doubtful," but well sustained by facts, and known in ancient times, which Bochart has already thoroughly proved), but at the same time it is also justified by God's important procedure, which shows it to be worthy of its place in the in-

troductory part of Israelitish history. Apart from this latter fact, it does not appear how the history in general could be sustained; but from that it derives high importance, while it tells us of the sufferings of Jacob, of his patience, and of the aid afforded him by God. But the particular manner in which this divine blessing is revealed to Jacob, is quite in agreement with the life of patriarchal times, and hence is so peculiar, that invention, which must also be marked by a connexion with later times and customs, cannot here be thought of.

Again, how should an inventive writer, supposing it was his intention to dignify the primitive history of his nation, come to mention here that the sons of the Patriarch, the ancestors of the twelve tribes, were not all alike descended from his proper wives? Would he have allowed that to pass without alteration? Josephus *e. g.* finds himself not a little annoyed by this fact: he calls Bilhah and Zilpah *θεραπαινίδες*, and says, *δοῦλαι μὲν οὐδαμῶς, ὑποτεταγμέναι δὲ αὐταῖς* (Ant. i. 19.). With like impartiality he mentions the use of the Dudaim (xxx. 14, ff.), on which Rosenmüller (p. 463) remarks: "sanctitatem autem et verecundiam Rachelæ non multum laudârit, qui ejus historiam sine partium studio legerit.—Mores certe a patre non meliores edocta erat, quippe qui filiam suam virginem inscio Jacobo prostituebat." He even makes as little concealment of the fact that this family already practised idolatrous worship, as the story of the abstraction of the Teraphim shows; comp. xxxv. 2—4. There among the objects serving this purpose express mention is made of the *Earrings* (נזמים), which were employed as Talismans, but which occur nowhere else in the Old Testament in this special sense. These then are plainly indications which cannot be explained as recorded in a later age than the Mosaic.

The only ground of any importance against this historical view is the following: "the etymologies affixed to the names of Jacob's sons are *partly* very forced, and *all* of them certainly invented." De Wette, p. 128. The only example which he adduces of defective etymology is the name ראובן, which should naturally be explained—"*behold a son!*" not considering that this very explanation is one that agrees exceedingly well with the words of Leah.[1]

[1] As *e. g.* Rosenmüller, p. 450, correctly explains it: "videte ut mihi filium Deus dederit et hoc me signo ostenderit non esse a se abjectam."

This conclusion therefore is quite an over-hasty one. For that in some of these names uncommon words should occur, is a thing not to be wondered at, considering our limited knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, and affects a large number of proper names, by which the stores of the Hebrew language may be enriched. Thus the etymologies here only go to prove the exactness of the narrative. Still stranger is the way in which it has been attempted to throw suspicion on the passage xxxi. 44—54. This is alleged to have for its object the explanation of the name *Gilead*, which would be more correctly deduced from Gilead, a descendant of Manasseh's (De Wette, p. 131); and the conferring honour on *Mizpah* (Von Bohlen, p. 311.). But apart from the geographical errors of the last-named learned writer, the contrary may here, with little trouble, be demonstrated from the text itself. The mountains of Gilead are here plainly enough distinguished from the place of the covenant: the latter is called *Galed*, and appears nowhere else in the Old Testament under that name. It must even be a matter of doubt whether the name of this *Mizpah*, derived from that occasion, is likewise found subsequently in the Old Testament, since מִצְפָּה and מִצְפֶּה are applied to so many localities, and according to the present passage the name of this place would require to have the article (הַמִּצְפָּה). At any rate no other author makes mention of a place, bearing at once both names of Galed and Mizpah. At the same time this passage, by the description which it gives of the covenant in a peculiarly ancient fashion, affords a new proof of its antiquity.

In ch. xxxii. the advocates of the mythical explanation are still more at a loss. It is certainly a remarkable section, but how meagre does it become when deprived of its deeper meaning. That Mahanaim is not mentioned simply for the sake of the etymology, as De Wette thought, has been recognized by Ewald (comp. d. Gen. p. 245): "the mention of the city (he says) is indispensable for the understanding of what follows; the etymology is a mere incidental matter." Besides, we are not told what should have induced the fictitious writer of a late age to seek to give distinction to this particular city here; he had in fact no such purely ideal object in view; he regarded it as his highest theme to give a faithful report of history. The same remark applies to the local name *Peniel* (the face of God): who indeed can suppose that a place

which brought such disgrace upon itself in Gideon's time (Judg. viii.), and which was subsequently raised by Jeroboam to be one of the chief cities of the revolted kingdom of Israel (1 Kings xii. 25), supplied any matter for arbitrarily connecting such fictions with it?[1] It must be confessed the mythical explainers here find themselves in a strange dilemma, from which they can escape only by admitting the historical nature of the thing. In proof of the truth of the fact that Jacob wrestled with God, the author himself adduces an old custom which derived its origin from it; could he here also have ventured to indulge invention without the fear of being detected? For the fact is one with which the oldest prophets are acquainted, and which bears the highest significance (Hos. xii. 4, 5.). The prophet would have shown little experience in addressing such admonitions to Israel, had he referred to newly-invented tales, which were not warranted to every one as primitive sacred history. And how is the fact itself assailed? Analogies and parallels are here too unsuitable to be employed in explanation of it; for it is possessed of a very peculiar importance in Israelitish history in general. Recourse is therefore had to some such shift as Hartmann employs: "Who does not see in the device by which there is brought out of the name of Israel, Jacob's contest with the invisible Jehovah, who is likewise represented as being seen face to face (which embellishment is squeezed out of the name of a place), a similar invention of human conceit and senseless conceptions of the supreme being?" This pseudo-exegesis of our age might well be put to shame by the words of Herder, (which remain true, even when the objective character of the narrative is maintained, as by us, throughout): "That which is most beautiful in the occurrence, however, is its internal meaning: the anxious patriarch was to be convinced how little occasion he had to be afraid of Esau, since he had overcome Jehovah by prayer, and Elohim by his arm." Indeed, to discover conceit and absurdity in this idea, betokens a shallowness of dogmatic judgment that is almost incomprehensible.

Chaps. xxxiii. and xxxiv. The more closely that these two chapters are shown to be connected, the more difficult must it prove for those who regard them as consisting of pure invention, to make

1 It is quite absurd of Stähelin, p. 110, to suppose that the city was not built till after the division of the land, because it is not mentioned in the book of Joshua; and still more so to suppose that in ver. 31 a city of that name is already spoken of.

out a common ideal principle from which these narratives have proceeded. But we find ourselves deceived in this expectation. Von Bohlen, though decidedly devoted to that view, says nothing of ch. xxxiii., but that the author attempts to prove the lawful claim to Sichem, while the giving of a name to Succoth is interwoven with the account. Nothing farther is stated as to what connection with this object that part of the section has which treats of Jacob's relation to Esau, and forms evidently a chief point in it: it is merely said, that the author is unable to conceal a certain fear of the neighbouring Edomites. Strange! How does this same alleged fear agree at all with the juridical object displayed in the claims to Sichem; and, in general, what connection is there between Edom and Sichem or Samaria? According to p. 325, however, ch. xxxiv. is expressive of an animosity towards that city, and also of its religious importance, as a Levitical and free city: its inhabitants were of heathen descent (where is this so much as hinted?)—they were not proper Jews by birth, but had been subsequently circumcised, and had been severely punished at that time by the ancients. Not to remind one how well such an "animosity" towards the city, on the one hand, and, on the other, the defence of its honour, can be conceived as being both united in the object of the writer, we have a contradiction of the above in the remark of Von Bohlen, p. 326, that this narrative has been invented to explain the expressions of an older poem concerning Levi and Simeon, Gen. xlix. 5, 6, and that it is pervaded by the most violent religious intolerance of the latest age. Here, again, is contradiction upon contradiction! For the object of the narrator would then necessarily be one opposed to the two patriarchs, Simeon and Levi, whose violation of the compact and perjury are here rebuked, and not to the Sichemites, who here appear besides in a favourable light—but how then can there be an expression of religious intolerance here? How is this at all imaginable, especially in connection with the mention of Levi?

But, in particular, the poetical passage in Gen. xlix. 5, 6, that has been alluded to, forms a striking confirmation of the narrative. For it necessarily presupposes such a fact as the present. In addition to this, the main point of the fact contains an internal proof of its truth. The brethren of Dinah ground the reason of their rage and their cruelty to Sichem, on Sichem's having dishonoured their sister. The only punishment attached to this by the subse-

quent Mosaic enactment was, that the seducer must marry the seduced (Michaelis, Mos. Recht v. p. 296, ff.). Now, since Sichem is not only eager to do this, but offers also the purchase-money and the bridal present, as well as submits to circumcision, we have evidently a custom here which stands independent of that legal appointment, and on that account cannot be considered as the later invention of an author who was guided by the enactments of the theocratic law; for the brethren regard the act of Sichem as a deed of infamy (נבלה, see Clericus on Deut. xxii. 21.). If we compare now with the view that is here attributed to the brethren that of the East, and of the Arabians in particular,[1] it is plain that the former, in this case, occupy as yet a similar standing-point, which must appear quite in conformity with their age.—Another part of the historical character of the document lies in the following circumstance. When Abraham came into this district, there was as yet no city in it (xii. 6), and the first mention of the city is in Jacob's time, on this occasion; and since the son of Hamor was called Sichem, it is not improbable, as Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. ii. 2, p. 119, remarks, that Hamor founded this city, and named it after his son. This receives a remarkable confirmation from Judges ix. 28, where Gaal says to the Sichemites—"why do ye not rather serve the descendants of Hamor, the father of Sichem?" from which it is plain that this family, which had certainly still maintained itself here, along with other Canaanitish inhabitants of the land, as appears from the prevalence of the worship of Baal, was regarded as the renowned ruling hereditary family of the place;[2] and hence Hamor is there expressly designated the father of Sichem. When the accounts we have agree together so well, there appear no grounds whatever for the doubts of De Wette (p. 135), and Von Bohlen (p. 326.). They serve also to explain much in our document, which otherwise would startle us, but now tends to verify it still further. This is especially true of the circumstance, that we must represent to ourselves the place as an insignificant one, just in its rise, since Simeon and Levi with their adherents venture to attack it in the manner described;[3]

[1] Comp. Abulf. Hist. Anteisl. p. 120. Fleischer, Schultens, Monum. vet. Ar. p. 35, Koran Sur. xvi. 59—61. Rosenmüller, A. u. N. Morgenl. i. p. 170.

[2] The explanation of the passage given by Studer (Comment. p. 252, ff.) is very forced, and abandons the simple sense without sufficient reasons.

[3] Which is besides designated, verse 25, a bold undertaking (בֶּטַח), so that it is an erroneous assertion of Von Bohlen that the writer had the tribes in his view.

connected with which also is the easy explanation which this affords of the prompt acquiescence of a small city in the desire to have themselves circumcised, and their carrying this so quickly into effect; in which, besides, is to be taken into account, that that religious custom must readily as such have obtained admission among the Sichemites, according to the mode of thinking prevalent in antiquity. Finally, the remark of Ewald (Kompos. d. Gen. p. 248) that our author in verse 7 transfers the colouring of his own times to that of Jacob's sons, is quite correct, since the phrase referred to —"wrought folly in Israel"—is a *Mosaic* one (Deut. xxii. 21), and to its introduction here is to be ascribed its frequent use in the later books.

Ch. xxxv. Here, it is said, we have "local legends reflecting the age of the narrator" (Von Bohlen, p. 332): we are curious to learn what age this may be. Leaving Succoth, Jacob arrives at Sichem, where he puts away the foreign gods: the tree, under which he buried them, should be one well known in the subsequent history. And, in fact, the next occasion on which we meet with Sichem and its oak, is Joshua xxiv. 26, which passage certainly stands in the closest connection with the present. Joshua admonishes the people to put away from them the gods, which their fathers had served in Mesopotamia (verse 14, 23), and the locality supplied him with the most significant occasion for this. As Jacob here put away from his house the idolatry of Mesopotamia, so should it now be done by Israel. Thus this latter narrative necessarily presupposes ours: an important fact occurring immediately after the time of Moses is founded upon it. This again brings us back by like necessity to the Mosaic composition of the passage; at that time it had full significance to the people of God. The identity of this tree with "the oak of the enchanters"[1] Jud. ix. 37, is a point hard to be defended: if admitted, it is still less intelligible how this narrative was made out of it; but at Sichem there was certainly an oak-grove (Gen. xii. 6; Deut. xi. 30), and idolatry was there quite at home even in the time of the Judges: but how does it follow, then, that it is the same tree that is referred to?

At Bethel Deborah dies, and is buried under "the oak of mourning" (אלון בכות), verse 8. This tree is mentioned nowhere else

[1 Called in our version "*the plain of Meonenim*.—Tr.]

in the Old Testament; so that no particular distinction appears to have been connected with it in later times; perhaps it became quite unknown. Von Bohlen, however, p. 334, thinks that "the oak of mourning" was identical with "the palm tree of Deborah," Jud. iv. 5, which may also have suggested a name for the nurse. What must the arbitrary genius of fiction have done, even to make oaks out of palm-trees!

From Bethel, Jacob arrives at Bethlehem. Now Von Bohlen is of opinion, p. 336, that Bethlehem acquired importance for the first time as David's birthplace, and that on that account memory willingly dwells upon it. If we look to 1 Sam. x. 2, we find that, previously to David Rachel's grave appears as a place universally known; we are thus referred back again to the present passage,[1] as the earlier one. In addition to this, the prophecies of Micah (iv. 8, v. 1, 2), as well as those of Jeremiah (xxxi. 15) refer exactly to this passage, and have regard to this occurrence of antiquity.[2] How can that circumstance be explained? It is manifest that with the later writers the reminiscence connected with the patriarchal age far exceeds in weight and importance that relating to David's origin. Thus we are quite thrown back on the very earliest accounts, which later writers here had before them. The situation of the "tower of the flock" (*Edar* v. 21) is quite unknown to us. Jacob's firstborn here commits the deed of infamy. Why does the so-called fictitious writer lay the scene of this act just at this place? Besides, how comes he at all to "invent" such an occurrence? "To account for the paternal curse (xlix. 3)," says Von Bohlen, p. 332. But what gave rise to that? Whence this dislike to the Reubenites in general, supposing it belonged to a later period? We see that this pseudo-criticism abandons us just where we most desire a solution. Every circumstance in the subsequent history points to a fact which shall account for it. Here we have such a fact, simply and briefly presented: let the attempt be made to prove the impossibility of its occurrence.

Ch. xxxvi. We have here a particularly important section, which gives us an account of Edom's most ancient history, and the critical examination of which leads at the same time to an important

[1] Comp. ver. 20. It is to be considered how, in ancient times, graves generally were spared and held in honour. Winer, Reallex. i. p. 522.

[2] See on Micah, Hengstenberg, Christol. 3, p. 276, 294, 330.

conclusion as to the genuine historical character of the present book. (1.) In the first place, the whole character of this genealogy speaks for its truth, since every attempt to point out an artificial plan in the invention of it, must be an utter failure. Even Von Bohlen, p. 343, says: "With regard to most of the names through the whole of the chapter, no reason at all appears for the invention of them." But still more than the names, the scattered historical notices, which have no light thrown upon them by any subsequent history, and in part are very obscure, as in vers. 24, 35, are incomprehensible, supposing them to be the work of invention; or such statements as, that the sons of Oholibamah, and not the grandsons, as in the case of the rest, became princes of tribes; or so careful a distinction as that which is made between the heads of tribes appointed immediately by Esau himself, and those who subsequently raised themselves to that honour.[1] (2.) The only knowledge we have of the Horites is from the Pentateuch, from which we here learn, in accordance with Deut. ii. 12, 22, that they were the original inhabitants of the land, and were subsequently, but still in the ante-Mosaic period, expelled by the Edomites. Here now we have an exact account of the primitive constitution of this people, which subsequently fell altogether into oblivion. (3.) The lineal constitution of the Edomites is not less peculiar. They are first under princes of tribes, and then under kings, without however recognizing an *hereditary* dynasty, which agrees perfectly with the character of this race (see Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. 3, p. 70.). The princes of tribes appear here under the very peculiar name אלופים, which in its present sense is known only to the Pentateuch,[2] and this distinguishes them exactly from others, the אילי מואב,[3] Exod. xv. 15, in conjunction with whom mention is also made of the kings of Edom (Num. xx. 14.). If we look now to the next subsequent period, in which the Hebrews came in contact with the Edomites, we find them then with a totally different political constitution: under Solomon a hereditary dynasty already exists in Edom (זרע המלך), 1 Kings xi. 14. Farther, the number of the Edomitish kings

1 Comp. Ewald, Komp. d. Gen. p. 254, 255.

2 The meaning of the word was afterwards quite mistaken. See Hengstenberg, Christol. 2, p. 282.

3 LXX. correctly, ἄρχοντες Μωαβιτῶν. Afterwards this expression is found in another sense. See my Comment. on the Book of Daniel, p. 20.

here mentioned is one that is quite suitable, so that J. D. Michaelis justly calls the opposite assertion rash and wild (Einl. p. 161.). Yet the expression: "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," ver. 31, is said to lead us unquestionably to a post-Mosaic period;[1] the answer frequently made to this, that the document here refers to earlier promises, being treated as a mere make-shift. "Is it at all imaginable (says Stähelin), that in a purely historical account an appeal should be made to a previous prophecy, and that the time, at which that should receive its fulfilment, should be assumed as a point from which to reckon back." But how can that be regarded as being in itself unimaginable, which is the general custom of the Hebrew historians, and of our author in particular, who lays so much stress on the divine promises? But here in the very account of Esau's prosperity, we have an unmistakeable reference to the earlier announcement xxv. 23, for it is plainly its object to point out the greatness of Edom, and his growth into an important nation. Why should it then surprise us, if regard is had to the promises given to Israel? This was almost unavoidably necessary, after what had immediately preceded. Jacob was deeply humbled before Esau; his heart was then cheered anew by fresh divine consolation, and his attention was directed to what Jehovah had formerly declared, that kings should spring from him, xxxv. 11. Thus the author might well say here;—before, according to that divine promise, a king reigned over his people, Edom was already a powerful state, governed by kings. Indeed if we keep more closely in our view the prophecy xxv. 23, the remark of Musculus will appear, in reference to the Mosaic composition, very much to the point: "Dictum erat a Deo, major serviet minori. At dum minor servit in Ægypto, major regnat in Seir. Sic comparatæ sunt divinæ promissiones." This is certainly an important consideration for the right estimation of our author, who everywhere pays attention to the course of the divine promises, and accords them unconditional belief. It is also at bottom the opposite of that belief, which leads our opponents to make such an assertion: they regard the promises as concocted *post eventum*, and thus one error proceeding from dogmatic prejudice and a contemptuous rejection

[1] Comp. *e. g.* of the most recent writers, Stähelin, p. 109, Von Bohlen. p. 69, and others

of the divine plan of education, necessarily brings after it another, resting on a like basis.

4. Again, both the credibility and the Mosaic composition of the document are particularly confirmed by ver. 39. The author names Hadar as the last king of Edom: he not only does not mention his death, but he gives us also exact information as to his wife's descent. Thus this king is clearly discovered to be a contemporary of the historian. Von Bohlen, p. 342, thinks that the fourth-named king here is Hadad, a contemporary of Solomon's (1 Kings xi. 14), and that our document thus betrays its age certainly in a very simple manner.[1] But Hadad's attempt to make himself master again of the throne of his fathers, was most probably a fruitless one, at any rate its consequences lasted but a very short time. This conclusion is rendered necessary because of 1 Kings xxii. 48, where it is expressly said, that there was no king in Edom, but only a (tributary) Satrap (under-king); comp. Rosenmüller, l. c. p. 71. Our author could not possibly have said in that case, "Samlah reigned in his stead," ver. 36. This then makes it clear, that the section in general was not composed in the age of David and Solomon; but, on the contrary, as the only instance, in which the Israelites came in contact with an independent king of Edom at an earlier period, was in the age of Moses, king Hadar must indisputably have been a contemporary of Moses.

Chap. xxxviii. Here also we have testimonies in abundance of the internal truth of the history. We do not at all understand, how Von Bohlen, p. 363, who calls every thing here, even to the genealogy, a fiction, can represent the design of it to be the introduction of the ancestors of the royal line of David into the earliest age, as being sprung from the tribe of Judah. The episode, in his opinion, is conceived in a genuine Jewish spirit. This, however, is evidently contradicted by the consideration that, if such a fiction is to be explicable as betraying a "genuine Jewish" spirit, it must appear, as in all cases of the kind where the glory of a favourite object is sought, in the pedigree assigned to David. But how shall we reconcile this with a main incident in the narrative, Judah's Canaanitish marriage? It is plainly in our author's intention to show how

1 This combination is the more rash, as that name was certainly one of frequent occurrence, being the name of a Syrian deity. See Hitzig on Isaiah, p. 215.

hateful such a marriage was to Jehovah, hence it is punished in the most decided manner.[1] Is it a false partiality that appears in this, or is it not rather a true and unprejudiced narration?

The law concerning the Levirate, Deut. xxv. 5, was entirely founded on ancient family usage; and the supposition of such usage is the more necessary because it is only thus that it admits of being properly conjoined with the rest of the Mosaic marriage-laws: comp. Benary, l. cit. p. 16, sq. We have then in this history an instance of a usage deeply founded in family-relations, the antiquity of which is also evidenced by the fact, that the marriage of the widow appears here to be a matter of unconditional necessity, and in no way to be dispensed with, which it might, at a subsequent period, according to the Mosaic ordinance. The same high antiquity is not less evidently displayed in the way in which Judah here brings Tamar to trial. "Vix est dubium (remarks Rosenmüller, Schol. p. 590) fuisse ante constitutam Hebræorum rempublicam judicia in liberos penes patres familias, ut olim apud Romanos, v. Liv. ii. 41. Præterea Scenitæ seu Nomades, quales Jacobus et filii, non parebant Phœnicibus, sed liberi prorsus suique juris illos tractus peragrabant, ut igitur Juda, familiæ suæ princeps et summus ejusdem magistratus, ultimum supplicium in Thamarem nurum ipse decernere potuerit; cf. Michaelis, de Nomad. Pal. § 3, comment. i. p. 213.

§ 21. CONTINUATION. THE HISTORY OF JOSEPH. GEN. XXXVII.—XXXIX.—XLVII.

The tradition of the Hebrew nation having at one time been in Egypt gave occasion, it is said, to this fiction, in which no other portion of truth need be recognized, than simply that undeniable tradition. This is the judgment passed by the latest school of critics on this section (Von Bohlen, pp. 349, 412, 419, ff.). What was the object of the fiction? "That it might seem that it was not in the character of wandering shepherds, and by mere accident, that the children of Israel travelled down into the fruitful valley of the Nile; but, to give their march a resemblance to a triumphal entry, as they were invited there by one of their own relatives, the favourite of his father." The fictionist's object was apologetical; he wrote to

[1] Comp. Benary, De Hebræorum leviratu, p. 16.

advance the glory of his nation, embellishing their history with the marvels of his fancy.

If we take as an historical basis the fact of the descent into Egypt, in this its simplest (as alleged) fundamental element, important concessions are at once involved in it, which lead us to regard it as an inconsistency that our opponents should have believed themselves obliged to retain this fundamental historical element as such. There lies, indeed, at the bottom of this inconsistency, the truth, which forces itself irresistibly into view, that without such a basis the whole of Israelitish history is so completely annihilated, that it must be consigned to the domain of fancy, while the historian, if he wishes to exhibit positive results, must play the part of a romance-writer. Hence even such investigations as those of Vatke, Bibl. Th. i. p. 184, come back to the admission of this fact, since otherwise they must look round in vain for any historical point of support.

But then there arises here precisely this important question, *how* did Israel come into Egypt?—a question which has been evaded, indeed, but a reply to which must, on our part, be as decidedly insisted on. How comes it that a poor pastoral people, who from their mode of life were regarded with contempt, meet with a willing reception in this foreign state, which was already well-organized? How is it to be explained that they should continue there such a long space of time, and that too not in such a way as to surrender their own peculiar existence, by mingling themselves with the inhabitants of the country into one nation, but persevering in the possession of their independent nationality? Since in general to a constitution such as the Egyptian was from the most ancient times, the nomadic life and pursuits constantly formed an antagonist element, which it could never quite adopt into itself (Strabo, p. 1142, Casaub. Heliodor. Aeth. i. 5), such a connection as that of the Israelites with the Egyptians becomes the more remarkable and surprising.

Hence Hartmann (p. 433) also confesses that it is impossible, if we would not annihilate all historical belief, to deny that Joseph was in a state of slavery in Egypt, from which he gradually (??) rose to the dignity of Grand Vizier. A series of facts such as are here related, is necessary in order to explain to us that one fact, the abode in Egypt. But still it is thought impossible that they could have that form which they bear in the narrative of the Pen-

tateuch. Attempts have been made to represent the history as incorrect, partly in general, and partly in its details.

Von Bohlen commences his argumentation on this subject with suppositions of a very strange kind. The names of the patriarchs are to be viewed as pure abstractions, which a later period turned into persons, and introduced as acting: this must more especially be the case with Joseph, because "he is only the father of two tribes, which the writer has present to his mind in all their importance, and views with an overweening regard." This importance may certainly be admitted in reference to Ephraim, but by no means in respect of Manasseh; while it is difficult to explain such a regard in an author, who is said to be guided by partial Levitical principles, and would thus be inimically disposed to Ephraim: besides it is not they, the founders of these tribes, but Joseph their father, who is brought forward in our history; so that the narrator is charged with an intention of which he gives no indication. And what a conclusion it is: Joseph's sons are the names of two tribes, consequently Joseph himself is a mere abstraction! There is certainly also a difficulty overlooked here, which presses upon our opponents. It must be regarded as a fact with which the nation at large was necessarily well acquainted, that Ephraim and Manasseh, being the grandsons of Jacob, did not possess as tribes an originally equal right with his sons:—how should they then have been satisfied in reference to our record in general, on the one side, to admit such rights as belonging to a divided family line, and, on the other side, to allow their rights, supposing them to be differently founded, to be accounted for and represented in this manner?

Von Bohlen next makes the remark here, which he frequently does (comp. pp. 351, 339, 370), that the chronology betrays the fiction; observing that the sexagenarian Joseph is here made a youth of seventeen years of age. This calculation assuredly rests upon a supposition, which proves the writer's animosity to our book, and at the same time equally proves him to be wanting in regard for the truth. The only chronological statement in our book, which can guide us here, is that in xlvii. 9, that Jacob was 130 years old when he stood before Pharaoh, and from that we must reckon backwards, in order to obtain a safe date. From this it results that Joseph was born in Jacob's 91st year, for thirty-nine years had elapsed since then, which is the only computation that

agrees also with xxxvii. 2, and since Jacob remained twenty years in Mesopotamia, and Joseph was born there, it must have been a considerable time after Esau's marriage, which took place in his fortieth year, that Jacob left Canaan (xxvi. 34), which everything here also tends to shew (xxvi. 35, and the occurrence ch. xxvii.). But our chronologer reckons differently. According to him, Jacob must have been forty years of age when he went out of Canaan into Mesopotamia, of which nothing is mentioned; he must have been sixty when he left it again; and since Isaac died 180 years old (xxxv. 29) Jacob must have spent on the journey from Charan to his father—the period of sixty years. In this way it is possible everywhere to discover the most nonsensical chronology, if one *invents* for himself the most arbitrary dates.[1]

Von Bohlen farther complains of the way in which events are accounted for by dreams and their interpretation. "These, however, are undeniably shown to be fictitious, by their repetition, their symbolical nature, and the numerical regularity of eleven stars and sheaves, three vines and baskets, seven kine and ears of corn." De Wette, p. 158, ff., thinks that Joseph's own dreams may very well be explained as the offspring of his own aspiring mind, but that we must regard the more doubtfully his skill in expounding dreams, which is made the lever of the entire history, such a foreknowledge of the future not being explicable in a natural way. If this view is meant to affirm in general, that a revelation from God by dreams can have no real existence, it takes up a position that is altogether uncritical, as it abandons the examination of the facts by which alone the reality of such a thing can be made out, and opposes them by an *a priori* argument, which is quite destitute of value, because it cannot show that there exists a contradiction between divine revelation in general, and this particular form of revelation; and consequently issues in the denial of divine revelation in general. We can, therefore, pay no regard here to the denial of a revelation by dreams, and the possibility of understanding such a revelation, but only to the particular way in which those dreams are here introduced. The theocratic idea of dreams is quite a peculiar one, as it makes a strict distinction between true and false dreams,[2] and hence it wants those notions which among the heathens are most essen-

1 Comp. on the contrary Ranke, l. c. pp. 28, 29.

2 Comp. Num. xii. 6; Deut. xiii. 2, ff.; Jerem. xxiii. 25; ff., xxix. 8; Zech. x. 2.

tially connected with that kind of prodigy.[1] In our narrative, however, it is the less possible to overlook this idea, since on the one hand all the occurrences connected with Joseph, both in his condition, and, in particular, his enlightenment in reference to the future, are traced to the aid of Jehovah, the living God (xxxix. 2; xl. 8; xli. 16, 28, 32, 39; xlv. 5–9; l. 19, 20); and, on the other hand, this divine procedure, this special providence, relating primarily to one individual, includes a higher meaning of more general range, connected with the preparation of the Theocracy. It is this characteristic that gives our narrative its complete truth in the wonderful supernatural relations involved in it, since its truth is dependent on, and involved in, that of the Theocracy itself, that also being a fact of an entirely supernatural order. Every attack upon the former must at the same time be an attack upon the reality of that divine institution. But as relates to the *form* of the dreams, that is certainly to be viewed as allied with, and subject to, the historical circumstances in which they appear. Each dream discloses a peculiar kind of symbols, invariably marked with the impression of the national or individual mind, to which also the divine revelation attaches itself in the way of condescension and illustration.[2] It is from this point of view, therefore, that we ought to estimate the formal construction of these visions; and it is impossible to explain how Von Bohlen can have performed this business, since he speaks of their "symbolical nature" as throwing suspicion upon it. We shall presently see reason for a contrary view, which will show how every vision here answers exactly to the circumstances and relations with which it stands connected.

The next charge advanced is against the particular details of the history, as guilty of historico-geographical inaccuracies and errors, as well as of improbable statements, that should clearly show it to

1 These include particularly the peculiar mythical view of dreams themselves, so far as they are connected with mythical personages, and are even raised to the class of mythi (by personification, &c.)—See Baur, Symb. ii. 2, p. 15, ff.;—and also the view that was held of the explanation of dreams, a faculty which, being mechanically attributed to certain persons, was practised by them according to certain rules, like all magic (ὀνειροπόλοι, ὀνειροσκόποι), so far as men concerned themselves to master the thing and turn it to their own profit; while, according to the theocratic view, dreams and their interpretation are regarded as the free gift of divine grace, and in no way capable of being confined by the narrow fetters of man's arbitrary will. Comp. Pareau, De myth. interpr. p. 137, sq.

2 Comp. my Comment. on Daniel, p. 137, ff.

be fiction. So the history of Joseph's youth (ch. xxxvii.) has been harshly assailed on like grounds.

Hartmann, p. 435, remarks that the account of Joseph's conduct to his brethren (xxxvii. ver. 2, ff.), is irreconcilable with the noble and pious character of Joseph. For such criticism this is an important concession! For presently after this the "ideal" portraiture of character forms a ground for the deduction that there is a want of historical truth. But the combining of both classes of phenomena by a just criticism would have led to the conclusion, that our author is by no means attempting here (any more than in the case of the other patriarchs) to set ideal delineations before us, but makes his personages speak and act conformably to history. V. Bohlen, however, has attempted to give the reason of this invention: "it may perhaps have contained an obscure reference (sic!) to the mutual relations of the tribes and their political position at the time (?):"—only this "obscure reference" is quite obscure to us too, whereas we ought to expect a "*clear* reference" in cases where an inventive writer is zealously pursuing certain definite objects. Thus this criticism is shipwrecked—as its indefinite phrase, "it may perhaps, &c.," shows—on the rock of an endeavour to point out the writer's object; and we cannot explain to ourselves this commencement of the narrative at all, unless we receive it as an historical account.

It will be admitted by every one that Joseph's dream of the homage paid him by the sheaves is well explained from the mode of life belonging to that age; but we must claim the same admission in behalf of the vision of the sun, moon, and stars. That we should regard it, however, as having to do with astrological notions, and with the signs of the zodiac, can certainly hardly be justified, since it is only single stars, not constellations (מזלות 2 Kings xxiii. 5; Job xxxviii. 32) that are here spoken of, besides that the mention of the sun and moon would not be suitable in that case. We should rather adduce the representation,—widely spread in the most ancient Oriental, as well as Grecian, system of symbols,—of distinguished noble personages, princes, &c., under these figures, which have become quite current and almost trivial in the later usage of the East (comp. Num. xxiv. 17); and then this terminology amongst a nomadic people, living constantly under the open sky, as the Hebrew Patriarchs did, will not surprise us, especially when

we have to regard the nomadic Arabs as the authors of the names of the stars and of astronomical nomenclature, though certainly in its most simple and primitive state (Ideler, üb. Urspr. u. Bed. d. Sternnamen, p. 423, ff.). Again, on the opposite side, an unchronological statement is pointed out in the circumstance that the dream requires the mention of his mother, which can refer only to Rachel already deceased (V. Bohlen, p. 355.). But we are not even at all necessitated to introduce Bilhah, as some expositors do, in order to explain this circumstance: the mention of the moon was demanded by the symbolicism of the dream; and as to Jacob, in his doubt and displeasure at it, asking whether indeed he and the mother and brethren of Joseph should bow down to him, that is merely the expression of the improbability which he attributed to the vision; the question is therefore to be explained simply by his adoption of the symbolicism of the dream: in the proper historical account no mention is anywhere made of Rachel.

No confutation is needed of such an objection, as that the account appears inexact and confused, in Joseph's making a journey of twenty [German] miles [about eighty English miles] to his brethren through all the native tribes of Canaan, and in his being rightly directed by a stranger, without so much as telling him his name (V. Bohlen, p. 353)—for it is impossible to determine what amount of difficulty and danger the journey at that time had for Joseph;[1] and it is evident that, in ver. 15—17, we have not the whole of Joseph's conversation with the man who directs him aright, the necessary filling up being understood of itself; and cases of that kind are to be found in every work of history. Not less foolish is the remark on the narrator, that he makes Reuben not to have heard his brethren's proposal, without mentioning his absence, which is necessarily implied in that fact, and therefore did not require to be stated by itself (see Ranke, p. 259.). The mention of the Ishmaelites and Midianites has been regarded as strange, since they could not as yet be regarded as proper trading nations (Hartmann, p. 436; Von Bohlen, p. 357.). Now, in the first place, it is not an important nation at all that is here spoken of: we do not so much as know how large the caravan was. But the

[1] Besides it appears from the record itself that Canaan must not be thought of as being nearly so well peopled at that time as subsequently: see ver. 22, and Clericus upon it.

very circumstance, that the names Ishmaelites and Midianites are here used interchangeably, can be sufficiently explained only by the fact, that the narrator here does not mean to lay any weight upon the nation (as that could also be of no importance for his object), but merely says that there were *merchants* (סחרים ver. 28) coming out of Arabia; and it hardly admits of dispute that these nations were known and famed in that character among the Hebrews in the time of Moses: in particular they are introduced in Judg. viii. 24 as such. Our author thus employs the current names of these nations, as being most given to traffic, to denote Arabian merchants in general, just as כנעני also occurs in this wider sense (Job xl. 30;[1] Prov. xxxi. 24; Hos. xii. 7; Is. xxiii. 8), without our being at all warranted to infer thence the existence of the Canaanites in their ancient condition.

It is thought improbable that the brethren should, "in so excessively rude and unfeeling a manner, send their father the blood-stained garment, and afterwards come to comfort him." (Von Bohlen, p. 353.). We for our part take just the very opposite view of this trait: the brethren continue true throughout to the character hitherto assigned them. The way in which they act at Sichem, the way in which Judah exhibits himself in the history of Tamar, Reuben's criminal connection with his father's concubine—these are plainly such traits as give a faithful picture of the rudeness, and even cruelty, displayed by the sons of Jacob. And even supposing that we were not acquainted with those facts, that argument, as resting on the mere supposition of a certain character, would prove nothing.

Von Bohlen's remark also on xxxvii. 36 deserves consideration. He thinks that the statement concerning Potiphar may very well have been borrowed by the writer from his own native institutions, and intimates oftener than once that the existence of such an institution in Egypt has first to be proved. He shows, in the first place, that at the Hebrew court eunuchs had constantly been employed. The use of סריס for *courtier*, in which sense it occurs in this passage, as it does almost everywhere in the Old Testament, could certainly not have arisen, had not the custom of castration been previously known. For the primitive signification of the word

[1] [In the Hebrew: in our English Bibles, xli. 6.]

is undoubtedly *an emasculated person*.[1] That this custom was known in the time of Moses, is plain from those passages in the law that prohibit castration (Deut. xxiii. 2, comp. Levit. xxii. 24); and its extensive spread in the East, as well as the referring of its origin to Semiramis, testify to its high antiquity (Brissonius, De reg. Pers. princ., p. 504.). The special office of this courtier is that of captain of the body-guard; and though Von Bohlen here also speaks of this being an institution that requires to be proved, he has forgotten that it belonged to the duties of the warrior-caste, to form the body-guard of the king. A thousand Calasirians and Hermotybians were annually required to perform this service at court, where they enjoyed free support (Herod. ii. 30, 168; Heeren, Id., ii. 2, p. 135, ff. 139.). Herodotus says: ἔτι δὲ ἐπ' ἐμεῦ καὶ Περσέων κατὰ ταὐτὰ αἱ φυλακαὶ ἔχουσιν, and this easily remarked similarity explains how, at a later time, the same expression was used of foreigners, when invested with that dignity.[2]

Von Bohlen has nothing to bring against ch. xxxix. to prove it a fiction, except the alleged unchronological statement concerning Joseph's age, which has already been refuted. For the far-fetched parallel of the story of Bellerophon must be declared by every intelligent enquirer, as by Winer, Real-WB. i., p. 712, to be one that leads to nothing. It is only in Hartmann, p. 438, that we find the objections brought forward, that "it testifies against the truth of the literal sense," that according to ver. 11 the people in Potiphar's house were absent, and according to ver. 14, they were called for. We should like to know, in what other way the author should have expressed himself; for a person who is present can hardly be called for, and besides the people could not have been present. Farther, בַּבַּיִת (in *the* house) is especially the Gynœceum, considered as a particular part of the house, and on that account called even בית as is well-known; see 1 Kings vii. 8; Esth. ii. 9. He also regards it as an improbable thing, that Potiphar did not have Joseph immediately punished with death, instead of putting him in prison, which we regard as remarkably natural, since Joseph was Potiphar's

1 The root סרס is related to שׁרשׁ *eradicare*, as שׁריון and סריון. See Hitzig, Heidelb. Jahrb. 1830. 8. p. 821.

2 For it is never used of native captains of the body-guard; comp. 2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 23; 1 Kings iv. 4.

favourite. And what means have we at all of knowing the character of the latter, so as to venture such a decision?

There is much more speciousness in the objection, which is particularly adduced by Von Bohlen, p. 374, against ch. xl. (comp. Vatke. Bibl. vol. i., p. 283), that the butler's dream contains an important date for proving the recent age of the narrative, since it supposes the existence of the vine in Egypt; whereas it was not till after Psammetichus, which was exactly about the time of Josiah, that the cultivation of the vine was sparingly attempted in the valley of the Nile, and it was not till after Psammetichus that they began to drink wine in Egypt, Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. 6. As to the first assertion, it is decidedly altogether incorrect. Herodotus indeed says *οὐ γὰρ σφί εἰσι ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ἄμπελοι*, ii. 77; but were we to take this expression in its absolute sense, he would be made to contradict himself (comp. ii. 37, 60), and the context also evidently shows that he is speaking only of one part of Egypt (*τὴν σπειρομένην Αἴγυπτον*, ii. 77, init.); and Heeren says correctly (l. c. p. 362), "certainly however the vine must have been confined to single high-lying districts." With this Strabo also (xvii., p. 799) and Diodorus Siculus (i. 36) agree; the latter of whom makes the Egyptians ascribe the introduction of the culture of vines to Osiris (comp. Tibul. Eleg. i. 8, Martian. Cap. ii., p. 39), and so Pliny H. N. xiv. 9, and Athenæus i., p. 33, who even speak of several kinds of wine and praise it. So we find representations on the monuments of vines and grapes, and of the labours of gathering and treading the grapes (Heeren l. c. and Leo, Universal-Gesch. i., p. 437.). That the culture of the vine has been very much neglected during the Mohammedan period can readily be understood; yet it is still to be found in abundance especially about Lake Mœris (Belzoni, Narrative of the operations, &c., p. 381), and excellent wine is to be had (Maileet, Descr. Ep. 8, p. 293, sq.). Thus then in Num. xx. 5, the vine rightly appears among the productions of Egypt, and is also reckoned among them in Ps. lxxviii. 47,[1] cv. 33. It must certainly however

[1] Where De Wette makes the following incorrect remark, p. 432, "the poet here offends against history." Since, however, wines are not mentioned in Exodus in connection with the occurrences referred to, we might certainly also adopt the opinion that there is here a transference to Egypt of agricultural circumstances proper to Palestine (see Credner on Joel, p. 132.).

be admitted to be probable that, in a country where wine is not exactly one of the most abundant productions, its use also should be limited. The people drank a liquor prepared from barley (Her. ii. 77, and Bähr upon the passage, p. 657), and at a later period they also used a sort of wine made of the fruit of the mulberry fig-tree (Abdallat., p. 19, De Sacy.). On the other hand, it appears to have been a privilege of the priestly order, that wine (*οἶνος ἀμπέλινος*) was given to them (Her. ii. 37); indeed it was allowed only to them and to the king (who belonged to the priesthood), and it was only on certain feasts (Her. ii. 60), and with express restriction to a certain quantity (Creuzer, Fragm. Hist. Gr. Ant. p. 28, sq.), that the people were permitted to taste it. In the present passage, therefore, it should appear quite suitable, to find mention made of the king's cup-bearer; and the drinking of wine as must and mixed with water,[1] as was commonly done in ancient times, agrees very well with that moderate use of it. Now as to the passage of Plutarch, which says, that the Egyptians drank no wine before the time of Psammetichus, nor even used it in libations, for they believed that it was hated by the gods, and that it made men frantic; an historical element may be at the bottom of it; but we cannot affirm it to be exactly true in the face of those accredited notices. We have a complete solution of the point in a passage of Chæremon (see Creuzer upon him, Symbol. i. p. 383) on Porphyry De Abstin. iv. 6, where it is said of the Egyptian priests, *οἴνου γὰρ οἱ μὲν οὐδὲν ὅλως, οἱ δὲ ὀλίγιστα ἐγεύοντο.* A distinction, therefore, had subsequently been introduced among the

1 The expression שׂחט in ver. 11, as it appears to me, necessarily leads to that view. [The author takes the word שׂחט, which occurs only here, in the sense "dilute with water," contrary to the rendering of the LXX., which is *εκθλίβω*, and the traditional interpretation of the Rabbins, which from its accordance with the former, deserves regard. The considerations which he states are, however, deserving of attention, though Gesen. in his Thes. takes no notice of them, nor even mentions this other rendering.—Tr.]. The signification—*to press out, to crush*—is quite incapable of proof. For the Arabic سحط and شحط [sabhat and shabhat] has not that signification (Freytag ii., p. 291, and p. 399), and the Rabbinic סחט owes that signification, as Schultens (animadvv. phil. ad h. l.) perceived, to this interpretation of the present passage. The tropical application of words of like signification to the mixing of wine, is however well-known; see Schultens l. l.; Gesenius on Is. p. 167, ff.; Döpke ad Mich. Chr. Syr., p. 152. That *grapes* (ענבים) are here put for *wine*, is easily explained, since it is freshly-pressed wine that is spoken of: comp. Horat. Od. i. 20, 10—tu bibes uvam: mea nec Falernæ temperant vites, neque Formiani pocula colles. The way in which שׂחט is written, is then very well explained, while שׂחט [in the sense of *alloy*] is used only of metals, as being the stronger formation; comp. Ewald. Gr., p. 39, and part 1st, p. 164.

priests in that respect, which we can very well explain in part by a later asceticism, as we meet with such also among other nations,[1] and the reasons adduced by Plutarch point plainly enough to later ascetic ideas of that sort, which obtained a hold among the Egyptians, and thence perhaps passed over to the Therapeutæ (Philo De vitâ contempt. p. 692, 696.). But in Plutarch's remarking on the times of Psammetichus in connection with this, there is certainly involved the truth, that after that period asceticism came forward prominently in opposition to the Grecian customs which were finding an entrance;[2] and one would in these circumstances very naturally venture the assertion, that such had been the earlier habit of the genuine priests.[3] That there was at least a decided expression, in this respect also, of the opposition felt to what was foreign, is shown by the passage of Chæremon, l. cit., where among other things it is said: *τῶν μὲν ἐκτὸς Αἰγύπτου γιγνομένων βρωμάτων τε καὶ ποτῶν οὐ θέμις ἦν ἅπτεσθαι.*

At any rate it is a rash procedure to represent entire abstinence from all wine, even if (which is by no means credible) it was maintained by all the Egyptian priests in the time of Plutarch, as practised in times so early as those which here come under review. What we find here agrees with the state of a nation which, even at an early period, was well regulated, and had fixed manners and rules; but not with the subsequent extravagance and perversion of the old simplicity of manners, partly on the one hand into dissoluteness, and partly on the other into the rough opposition of an ascetic rigour. Indeed, taken strictly, the drinking of wine does not follow at all from this passage, as it is only the fresh juice of grapes that is spoken of, which we may suppose was drunk in Egypt in a similar way to what is the case amongst the Mohammedans, Thus every difficulty on this point is completely removed.[4]

1 As among the Nabatæans, and others. Comp. Ælian V. H. ii. 37, and the interpreters on the passage; Wesseling, Obss. ii. c 2. Jablonski, Panth. Æg. i. p. 131, sq.

2 Especially after the Greek and Phœnician trade introduced a quantity of wine (Herod. iii. 6), which led to a corruption of manners; see Schlosser, Univers. Uebers. i. 1, pp. 183 and 187.

3 [Just as certain Teetotal fanatics have had the folly to assert that the use of fermented wine, that is *real* wine, is not sanctioned in Scripture.—Tr.]

4 [What Hengstengberg has written on the above subject is well deserving of attention. See his work entitled "Egypt and the books of Moses, illustrated by the Monuments of Egypt" (trans. with additional notes, and published by the publisher of the present work), pp. 13–18.]

The symbolical appearances in Pharaoh's dreams are particularly characteristic (ch. xli.): they are so genuinely Egyptian, that we find ourselves here quite on their domestic soil. While standing by the Nile, Pharaoh sees kine come up out of it—then followed the ears of corn. The Nile is the physical cause of Egypt's fertility: it is likewise a symbol of the year:[1] out of it comes up the cow, the symbol of Telluric-agrarian life, and of the productive power of nature, the most sacred of all animals;[2] connected with which is the ear of corn, a connection also recognized elsewhere in the old system of symbols.[3] The dream contained that which was so extraordinary, that none of the priests was able to explain it. The dream indeed indicates, on the one hand, the natural origin of the remarkable occurrence, but, on the other hand, the fact itself was an incredible one, not to be ascertained by mere human conjecture. "Verisimile est (Bochart excellently says, Hieroz. i. 435, Rosenm.) per septem annos fertilitatis Nilum ultra solitum exundâsse. Et contra, per annos famis, aut intra limites suos se continuisse prorsus aut eos parum excessisse. Quod naturae non tribuerim sed miraculo. Ita enim suadent Josephi verba, xxxi. 28: 'Deus ostendit Pharaoni quod facturus est.' Quippe utut naturae opera Deo etiam tribuantur, tamen extraordinaria virtus his videtur significari. Quin ipsa visio satis docuerat, aliquid hic futurum praeter naturam. Neque enim bovi naturale est, ut alter alterum voret."

Hence it is absurd of Von Bohlen, p. 421, to charge our document with the view that, from ignorance of Egyptian circumstances, it deduces the origin of the drought from want of rain; and it is also strange that he should say, contrary to the fact, that the periodical inundation of the river may very well now and then produce a less fertile year, but never fail entirely and for several years together; while Winer (Reallex. p. 712) has very justly remarked, that at that time the inundations of the Nile had not yet been profitably conducted and divided by means of canals and sluices. How much a "less productive" year mattered, may be seen in the histo-

1 Comp. Creuzer, Symb. i. pp. 275, 483.

2 As Plutarch says of the Nile: *οὐδὲν ὕυτω τιμὴ Αἰγυπτίοις ὡς ὁ Νεῖλος*, De Iside et Osir, c. 32; so Herodotus says of the sacred animal of Isis, *τὰς βοῦς τὰς θηλέας Αἰγύπτιοι πάντες ὁμοίως σέβονται προβάτων πάντων μάλιστα μακρῷ*, ii. 41.

3 Creuzer, iv. p. 70.

rical descriptions of the fearful distress arising hence;[1] and not less incorrect is the expression "now and then," for Rosenmüller justly remarks, "The history of Egypt is full of examples of the sad consequences of an incomplete inundation." (Alterthumsk. iii. p. 214.).

But the knowledge of this event has been also preserved among the Egyptians, in the strange tradition of Busiris, which as yet has hardly been properly estimated. That Busiris is not the name of a person, of a king, was known even to the ancients:[2] Diod. Siculus assures us, that the name signifies *a grave of Osiris*.[3] It was the Greek Logographi that first personified and nationalized him, by giving him a proper genealogy.[4] In his time, so ran the tradition, there were offered bloody sacrifices of red-complexioned men in honour of Typhon, whose colour is the same; and this subject was represented and decorated by the Greeks in many different ways, principally indeed in the Heraclean games, for Hercules was said to have overcome Busiris. We have here, at any rate, a contrast to Osiris: the dominion of death, instead of life: lamentation and mourning, instead of joy and pleasant life. At one time there prevailed a great drought and famine in the valley of the Nile,—this is expressly stated as the physical foundation of the mythus, and the traditions even speak of a drought in Egypt that lasted nine, according to others, eight years.[5] And we must necessarily suppose some historial occasion of the above, in order to explain the tradition, which otherwise is quite obscure, and stands out of the circle of Egyptian mythi. "We might well believe,—says Creuzer, p. 358,—in the occurrence of some period *of plagues* in Egypt in very ancient times, in consequence of which those sacrificial feasts were appointed." It must be well considered, that our first knowledge of this mythus is derived from very confused sources; hence in its Greek garb Herodotus would give no credit to it (ii.

1 Comp. *e. g.* Dschemaleddin. Rer. Æg. ann. p. 11, sq. ed. Carlyle. Abdollatif, p. 360. De Sacy. Volney, Reis. i. p. 150, ff.

2 Erastosthenes in Strabo, xvii. p. 862.

3 I. 88. Comp. Creuzer, Symb. i. p. 355, ff.

4 V. Apollod. ii. 5, 11, according to Pherecydes; comp. Sturz, Pherec. fragm. p. 141, sq.

5 Ἐννέα γὰρ ἔτη ἀφορία τὴν Αἴγυπτον κατέλαβε. Apoll. l. c.

Dicitur Aegyptus caruisse juvantibus arva
Imbribus atque annis sicca fuisse novem.

Ovid. Art. Amat. i. 647. Comp. Hygin. Fab. 56, ibique intpp.

45); but in its Egyptian form it must necessarily have a local physical foundation; and as according to the realistic view of the Egyptian wisdom, the life and sufferings of the god Osiris are identified with those of Nature, so that according to Plutarch Osiris is no other than the Nile,[1] the mythus of Busiris must also be embraced within the same range of view, as the continued suffering and dying of Nature, the unusual duration of the Typhonic dominion. The connection which this tradition has with that of the Egyptian hatred of foreigners, is also remarkable; but of what moment this is, will appear first in the sequel.

We shall here bring together some of the abundant traces that show the intimate acquaintance of the writer with Egyptian manners and institutions, and as these have no appearance of intention, or of being sought out, but come before us in incidental and interspersed notices, the credibility of the record is certainly not a little heightened by them. Thus he forgets not to remark, that Joseph was shaved when he was brought to the king, for so the Egyptian custom required (xli. 14, comp. Her. ii. 36, ibiq. Bähr, p. 558); and the expression comes so readily to our author, that he does not subjoin to the word גלח another to define it more closely, as is elsewhere constantly done in Hebrew, knowing well that his readers would be familiar with the term even in this elliptical mode of expression. The advice which Joseph gives to Pharaoh (xli. 33, ff.), is entirely founded on the Egyptian constitution. The royal revenues, the payments to Pharaoh's treasury, depended wholly (and in this modern Egypt at the present day has remained much the same as ancient Egypt in her customs) on the produce of the soil. The payment of the fifth (the חמש) in productive years, and the officers (פקדים) appointed to attend to it, are therefore quite in order. Diodorus mentions this as a primitive custom: it must also have prevailed at any rate previously to Sesostris, since it was he who gave the system its more practical form; see Heeren, p. 138, ff. The ceremony of exalting Joseph to his dignity is quite peculiar. This exaltation is the more explicable, where there existed a body of priests, which on account of its great wisdom was an object of the highest admiration to all antiquity: wisdom and so uncommon a gift of prophetic foresight must here have met with a

[1] Comp. Baur, Symb. ii. 2, p. 171, ff.

reception of no ordinary kind, and produced an especially deep impression. Joseph's dignity, however, is altogether of a priestly kind, for only in that way can he come near to Pharaoh in power and importance. He is clothed in vestments of byssus; for that is the peculiar dress of the priestly caste of Egypt: "vestes ex gossypio sacerdotibus Aegypti gratissimæ," says Pliny, H. N. xix. 1. 2 :[1] he is also adorned with the royal chain for the neck, which appears likewise on the monuments as a royal ornament: Pharaoh himself gives him a priest's daughter of Heliopolis to wife (see Heeren, p. 128); he rides in the second chariot, which is another genuine Egyptian custom, for on the monuments the king constantly appears in his war-chariot:[2] he receives a particular Egyptian name, the meaning of which has never yet been satisfactorily explained, but which appeared to the author to require no explanation to his contemporaries.

It is urged by V. Bohlen (p. 381) as a gross error regarding the nature of the climate in Egypt, that according to xli. 6 the ears of corn were blasted by the *east wind*, a statement which admits of being applied only to the circumstances of Palestine. We might indeed adopt the explanation, that the word קָדִים might be employed, even in the Hebrew of that age, as the appellation of a hot wind driving in from the desert, and that in a vision all the less stress should be laid upon the expression. But the remark is quite incorrect. The south-east wind, which is here called the east wind,[3] blowing in the months of March and April, is one of the most injurious winds, and of longest continuance, while the shelter that Egypt has from it by means of the Mokattem chain of mountains is only partial, and by no means extends to the whole country.[4]

The whole position of the Egyptians in reference to foreigners is strikingly described in ch. xlii. In the company of a larger caravan of foreigners (ver. 5), the brethren travel to Egypt. Joseph himself is here expressly designated as he that conducted the sale of the

1 Comp. Heeren, p. 133. Bähr ad Her. v. 1, p. 565. Judge hence, how erroneous is Von Bohlen's assertion, that Dan. v. 7 is to be regarded as an imitation of this passage.

2 Comp. *e. g.* Heeren, pp. 224, 237, 247, &c.

3 Just as the expression ים קדמני (*Eastern Sea*) for the *Dead Sea* (Joel ii. 19; Ezek. xlvii. 18; Zech. xiv. 8) could be properly used only by an inhabitant of Judea, but was certainly employed also by every Israelite.

4 Comp. Harmar, Beob. i., p. 64, ff. Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. 3, p. 220, ff.

grain,[1] on which Rosenmüller, Scholl. p. 634, makes the appropriate remark, that it is not the retail corn-trade that is here spoken of, which the sequel also shows was by no means attended to by Joseph himself,[2] but the fixing of the price of the large quantity of grain which was to be sold to foreigners, and the examination of the purpose for which they came, whether they were to be suspected or not. ("Ægyptii enim præ aliis gentibus diffidere solebant peregrinis.") Joseph's charging his brethren with being spies receives the more internal probability from the fact that this was a natural suspicion, as Egypt is particularly exposed to attacks on the side of Palestine (Her. iii. 5.). Farther, we find here an interpreter, quite in accordance with that character of separation, which subsequently gave rise to the formation of a proper caste of ἑρμηνεῖς (Heeren, p. 145.). It has been thought strange that so small a quantity of corn should have sufficed so long for Jacob's family, since it certainly seems as if mention were made only of ten asses laden with grain. But on a closer view of the whole, this very circumstance appears a very suitable one, quite in agreement with the course of the history as here narrated, which has been in part correctly recognized by Clericus. "Primum est (he says) Ægyptios nisi vellent horrea sua exhauriri, non debuisse ingenti copiâ simul triticum peregrinis potissimum vendere, ne procul aveheretur; satis enim iis frumenti non fuit ut remotissimas etiam regiones sustentarent. Itaque ut in fame fieri solet, magnum frumenti numerum uni viro simul non vendebant: quo factum ut sæpius ad eos esset redeundum. Alterum est, quamvis fames maxima fuerit, tantam tamen per septennium integrum non fuisse, nihil ut prorsus terra ederet frugum nullæque sererentur. Annus quo frumenti exigua copia provenit, hordei aliarumque segetum interdum ferax est, aut saltem iis non prorsus destituitur. Itaque in Ægyptum altero famis anno descendisse videntur Jacobi filii, ut frumentum dumtaxat cöemerent, eoque sæpius erant ituri cum aliunde æque commode nancisci aut majore simul copiâ non possent." This last remark, that the famine should be understood, especially as to Canaan, only in a very relative sense, is confirmed in the most definite manner by the narrative. Such passages as xliii. 11 show,

[1] הוא המשביר לכל-עם הארץ.

[2] So that V. Bohlen's assertion, who finds in this a proof of fiction, p. 390, is quite absurd.

that grapes, pistacio nuts, almonds, &c., were still to be had; but there was a deficiency in corn. Thus, so far from supposing, as V. Bohlen (pp. 395, 420) does, the existence of a very silly contradiction in that statement, and concluding thence the whole to be a fiction, we should regard it as demonstrating how far removed our document is from all arbitrary extravagance, giving by such individual traits, a delineation of the whole that is quite clear and satisfactory. That such a contradiction is far from supposable here, is sufficiently evident also from the close relation in which the eighth and the eleventh verses of ch. xliii. stand; he must have been the most thoughtless of narrators, who would have betrayed his arbitrary procedure, in passages that come so close the one upon the other, expressing himself thus at random.

In ch. xliii. also we find Egyptian costume exactly observed. For, when V. Bohlen regards it as an error, p. 397, that the narrator represents Joseph as having animal food prepared and eating of it, because "the Egyptians at farthest ate only the consecrated flesh of sacrifices, and the higher castes, especially the Priests, with whom Joseph had contracted affinity, abstained from all animal food," he is guilty of a gross mistake, which receives most decided contradiction from Herodotus (comp. *e.g.*, ii. 37, 40) and Diodorus. More precise laws relating to food are mentioned also by Chæremon in Porphyr. de Abstin. iv. § 6, and it is incomprehensible how so thoroughly ascetic a custom should be ascribed without any reason to the Egyptian priests.—Joseph eats apart from his brethren, keeping strictly to the Egyptian mode; and the history does not omit to remark that in this point he adhered exactly to the custom of the country.[1] It is also a peculiar custom which he follows, in setting before Benjamin a portion of honour five times larger than the rest. This must have been especially Egyptian, for elsewhere a similar thing is found,[2] but not quite the same; comp. also xlv.

1 This is the simple and natural explanation of the passage xliii. 32. In a similar manner the same remark is repeated xlvi. 34, in order to explain the fact of the Hebrews dwelling apart by themselves. We see that the remark could not have been dispensed with: it was every way necessary for understanding the fact. We do not then require either to suppose that the author's contemporaries were less acquainted with the peculiarities of Egypt—for it is not the custom in itself, but its application to these particular cases that is treated of—(V. Bohlen, p. 399) or to have recourse to the forced solution, that Moses wished to signify that the Egyptian habit of separation from all shepherds existed even in Joseph's time four centuries prior to his own (Hensler, Bemerkk. p. 403.).

2 See the collection in Dougtaeus, Anall. s. p. 50. Köster, Erläuter. p. 19 7.

22. But the mention of Joseph's cup in xliv. 5 is especially remarkable. The sacred cup is a symbol of the Nile, into whose waters a golden and silver patera were annually thrown: the Nile itself—both the source and the river—was called "the cup of Egypt" (Plin. H. N. viii. 71, Hug üb. d. Mythus, p. 137.) There was the beneficent cup, productive of all blessings, and at the same time displaying as a universal mirror the forms of all things; and in this character the Greeks also were acquainted with it (Athen. xi. 56, Creuzer, Dionysus, p. 25, sq.). The cup here also is described as such a prophetic one, imparting knowledge of the future: it is of silver, while in other cases the Egyptians drank out of brazen cups (Hecatæus in Athen. xi. 6, Herod, ii. 37.). The stress laid on the possession or the loss of it, shews the great religious importance it had among the Egyptians. There appears nowhere in Scripture any mention of this custom, and it is here interwoven in the narrative in so free and unconstrained a manner, that we can explain it only by supposing a very particular acquaintance with Egypt on the part of the writer and his age.

Pharaoh's enquiry, "What is your occupation? xlvii. 2, comp. xlvi. 33, is characteristic, and can be understood only from peculiar Egyptian circumstances; for it was only the strict distinction of castes that made that enquiry after their δικαίη ζοή of particular importance; comp. Diodor. i. 77; Herod. ii. 177; and Bähr on the passage p. 882. But especial importance belongs to the measures of Joseph, mentioned xlvii. 18, ff., in reference to the possession of land in Egypt. Our document speaks of a period in that country, which without it would be wholly unknown to us, when the possessors of estates were as yet free landholders. It mentions also the cause that led to the alteration of that state of things, so that afterwards, with the exception of the priestly caste, the king became superior proprietor of all landed estates. Thus it continued to the author's time, ver. 26; and as to the priests, even Herodotus and Diodorus speak of them as being quite independent possessors of the rents of free estates (Heeren, p. 130, ff.). With reference to this the history of Sesostris is particularly instructive, for to him the Egyptians ascribed the division of equal portions of land among all the inhabitants in return for the payment of a land tax (Her. ii. 109), which plainly implies according to Heeren's remark, that he considered himself as the superior proprietor of the whole land.

Subsequently the warrior caste appears to have acquired a more considerable claim to their estates, for Diodorus places them in the same category with the kings and priests, with regard to the possession of land (i. 73), with which Herodotus also (i. 168) agrees. Thus we have here at any rate the older constitution, by which the right of landed property was still confined to king and priest, and so this statement evidently appears to have been derived only from authentic and exact accounts. Every attempt to discover here some object to be served by the contrivance of fiction, has wretchedly failed, *e.g.*, the supposition that the author wished to represent the payment of tithes in the Levitical system as so much more tolerable; for an impost that should be paid to the priests and the temple is not spoken of here at all.

But, on the whole, Joseph's conduct towards his brethren, his putting them to the proof, and his investigation of their dispositions, when regarded from the mythical point of view, become quite inexplicable. V. Bohlen has wisely avoided pointing out any kind of idea, such as would betray fiction, as lying at the foundation of this: he himself indeed—though everywhere else "transparent myths" meet his penetrating eye—is obliged to make the confession, p. 401—"In this examination *no reason* can be discovered unless it were intended to account for the union still maintained between Judah and Benjamin" (ch. xliv.)—and then in spite of this hypothesis so violently introduced and unworthy of a refutation, he talks away in the next breath of "unbounded power of invention," &c. Supposing even he had succeeded in making good this assertion by more plausible reasons as to the one section ch. xliv., to which alone the hypothesis can apply, how would it stand then with the chief element of the whole narrative? how should we then explain to ourselves Joseph's person and conduct as the result and combination of the separate incidents? Here the mythical hypothesis must suffer complete shipwreck; for, if its supporters were to carry it out consistently, they would lose themselves in a bottomless abyss.

We have now in ch. xlvi. the register of the tribes, introduced with genuine historical fidelity to truth. The comparison of it with the statements respecting the tribes in Num. xxvi., and with the genealogies in Chronicles, puts its credibility and its antiquity beyond doubt. For each of these genealogies rests upon the other:

that which is contained in Genesis is expressly presupposed and has been made use of in the two later ones. In connection with this it is a circumstance not to be overlooked, that in Genesis we possess the *completest* list of Jacob's family. The deviations from it in the other genealogies are mainly confined to the omission of certain names. Thus, of the sons of Simeon, Ohad is afterwards wanting; of those of Asher, Joshua; of those of Benjamin, Becher and Rosh, &c. This circumstance admits of a sufficient explanation, only on the supposition that the sons who were subsequently omitted left no posterity behind them, on which account it would be intelligible that they should be passed over in the book of Numbers, where it is only families and races that are spoken of. Our document is thus acquainted only with the original relations of Jacob's family, at the time that he went down into Egypt, and is quite unconcerned about its later formation. Thus the view developed by V. Bohlen, p. 413, is completely refuted by the narrative itself. He supposes that the author wished to heighten the splendour of the descent into Egypt; and that therefore he had selected the ancient families of each tribe, so that he could reckon the more surely on their approbation, by placing their origin in the highest antiquity. But then, in order to render himself deserving of that approbation, he must necessarily have proceeded upon the circumstances and relations of his own time; but these had assumed quite another form even in the age of Moses, and still more so at the time when the (in part, fragramentary) genealogies of the chronicler had their origin. Should we then take up that position, we are deprived of all satisfactory explanation of the nature of our document. But V. Bohlen will also have it that he has made the discovery, that, at the date insisted on, there existed a diversity of opinion concerning the precedence of certain families, and even frequently concerning their names. The whole of his argument amounts only to this, that, as in all family registers, and not unfrequently also elsewhere, we find occasionally different names for the same person. But here now such names as Zephon and Ziphion show quite evidently that this variation consists in a more or less altered later pronunciation, or change of the same name, and is thence to be explained: the smaller and more insignificant diversity leading us to such a conclusion as the proper one in reference to the more important. But how should we explain this diversity,

supposing those genealogies had their origin simultaneously at a later period? Supposing such a thing in general can arise of itself, nothing but uniformity can be expected in the names. But if we firmly adhere to the separate historical existence of these genealogies, as stated in these books, the diversity is naturally explained by the interval of time between them. For the difference of appellations can hardly be conceived as proceeding from the same period and firmly established in it. Thus the very circumstances brought forward by our opponents of there being such diversities is a pledge of the credibility of the document.

§ 22.—CONTINUATION. GEN. XLVIII.—L.

At the close of Genesis we meet with two prophetic sections which form a very appropriate conclusion to a book which in its essential nature is of a deeply prophetic character: we have here the beautiful completion of the series of predictions with which the patriarchs were honoured. Unless we are influenced by a dogmatic prejudice, that protests against all predictions in general, we must recognise therein only a new necessary development of the Theocracy in its preparatory stage.

The situation of Jacob's family had become quite a peculiar one by the removal to Egypt. Called to the exalted position, to be the bearer of the glorious revelations of Jehovah, and for that purpose to inherit the land of promise as a pledge of Divine grace and truth, it had been brought nearer to the object of those promises by that event. Here now there occurred a turning point in the history of this family thus appointed to the highest destiny. It was not as a family, but as a nation (xlvi. 3) that it should attain to that possession; but a nation requires a different preparation and training, and one more powerful and influential, than the single head of a tribe with his dependents. Egypt with its alluring pomp, its body of priests, and its idolatry, was not to be the domestic soil of this people: it was to depart from the land of bondage, led by the hand of God. In the midst of a heathen land and people, which occupied a prominent place in the world at that time, the victory and triumph of the Theocracy should be proclaimed: as everything in the theocratic life became represented also in external reality, and pene-

trated through the opposite in a rugged concrete form, the initial point of the theocratic history must do so also. The departure of the Hebrews from Egypt has therefore a character of profound importance in reference to the whole structure of the Theocracy; and their entrance also has no less, on the same account. On the death of Jacob, the people, deprived of a common family head, remained in a certain degree left to itself. The consciousness of its higher unity could be preserved in it alive and active, only on the one hand negatively, by that which should be a contrast to the foreign and undomestic country, on the other hand positively, by a definite impressive tradition exercising a concentrating power. The end of the patriarch, therefore, when viewed in this light, is associated with what is lofty and important. That he appears endowed with an eminent gift of prophecy, is closely connected with the importance belonging to his person and character; which can be properly comprehended and estimated only from the peculiar theocratic point of view.

There is therefore no suitableness at all in the so-called parallels, which have been heaped together here by a misapplied industry, as if the standing-point and object of our record were identical with and explicable on that principle of heathenism—"facilius evenit appropinquante morte ut animi futura augurentur," Cic. De Div. i. 30. For whatever can be adduced here from that quarter, belongs partly to mere poetic fiction,[1] partly to the particular philosophic view of antiquity connected with that, according to which this department received the peculiar position which it held in the complete system of divination.[2]

But as the fundamental idea of ch. xlviii., xlix. is so firmly rooted in the soil of history, its exhibition is also carried out in a strictly historical manner. The prophetic outlines are kept quite general, receiving their more defined signification only from the course of events. The distinguished appointment of Joseph to be the founder of two tribes, and the transference of Reuben's right as the first-born to him, could be declared in no other way than by his first receiving a special blessing from his father. The mythical view is here evidently brought into a strait. It finds in ch. xlviii.

1 Comp. Hom. Il. π', 851, φ' 356. Virg. Æn. x. 470. Halbkart, Psychol. Homer. p. 41, sq.

2 Comp. *e. g.* Diod. Sic. xviii. p. 586. Wessel. Cic. De Div. i. 30, 64.

only "a priestly idea," which never had any proper reality: the intention being to remove back to an early epoch the double hereditary right, because the advancement of the priestly body and its hierarchical aims required this.[1] The object of ch. xlix., on the contrary, is quite different, being an anti-hierarchical one. And yet the two chapters are so closely connected together! But how will a hierarchical Levitical prepossession, especially of the time when it actively displayed itself in all its greatness, explain the blessing as it appears in xlviii. 16—20? No stiff Levitical fanatic, such as the spirit of the age depicts in its theology, could thus have honoured apostate tribes with so rich a blessing! How could the merely outward greatness of the tribe of Ephraim so impose on such a one, that he should find occasion to invent promises so grand? How can we imagine that the mutual jealousy of the tribes at a later period would so much as admit of the thought of such a limitation in reference to the others? Besides everything here appears specially connected with the person of Joseph:" it is said in xlviii. 15, "Jacob blessed Joseph." Thus the blessing itself can be understood only from the historical circumstances of that time.

Expositors have been particularly led astray by that view of Gen. xlix., which regards it as a production of art that is to be apprehended from a purely æsthetic point of view. We are by no means disposed to underrate the worth of the poem; only it should be mentioned, at the same time, that the contents and thoughts have here a prominent importance above the form, and throw the latter quite into the background. This makes it clear that it is quite impossible to associate this benediction with the poetry of the Davidic age, as V. Bohlen however does: one must cherish strange ideas of the latter, to be able to make such an assertion. The poetry here not only belongs, as decidedly as anything can, to an ante-Davidic and less cultivated form, but cannot for a moment be placed in the same category with such compositions as Ex. xv. and Judg. v., which are subject to more formal rules and are adapted to liturgical objects. Had more careful regard been paid to this, the worthlessness of the assertion that Jacob cannot have sung *thus*, would have been exposed; when, on the contrary, it is *only thus* that the poetry of that age can have been expressed.

1 See De Wette, p. 163. V. Bohlen, p. 429, ff. 484. Comp. Vatke, Bibl. vol. i. p. 221, ff.

The short sentences, the sententious character of this benediction explains, at the same time, what has frequently been called in question, the possibility of its faithful preservation. With reference to this also we need only recollect the traditionary poems among the Arabians and other ancient nations,[1] and it will plainly appear with what facility the East in particular, which has so much taste for poetry, takes up and faithfully preserves such compositions. Here, however, besides the peculiarity of the benediction as *prophecy*, as a valuable legacy to the children of Israel, has to be well considered. With these blessings are connected the position in which the different members of the family were to stand to one another, and their entire destiny; and even the earlier portion of the history makes us acquainted with the importance that was attributed to this paternal benediction.

But it is especially the internal character of this composition that proves its authenticity; which is of the more consequence here, as on the one hand it refers to the earlier history in such a way, and so includes it in itself, that that history stands or falls with it; and, on the other hand, it forms the basis on which the Mosaic benediction in Deut. xxxiii. is founded.[2] We shall not in this lay particular weight on the peculiar symbolism of the song, although its figures belong to a special order that has as yet been by no means fully appreciated. But there is at any rate a characteristic feature in the manner in which the prophecy, while its delineations are quite general, reflects with perfect accuracy the far distant future in which it was to be realized. It is also general circumstances, as viewed quite on a large scale, that are here regarded. Along with this, we must necessarily take into account the remarkable combination of this general standing-point with particular individual circumstances in each case. The personal character of the patriarchs, as the first and immediate recipients of this prophecy, has such regard here paid to it, that it is assumed as the point of view for that which is more distant. The person of the founder and the tribe are, as it were, equalized with one another; that which is prominent as the characteristic peculiarity of the former, finds its reflection in his posterity. As this happens in the case of several of them,

1 Comp. Hartmann, l. c. p. 292, ff.

2 For to suppose the reverse (as Bleek would do, in Rosenmüller's Repert. i. p. 31, ff.),—that Jacob's benediction arose out of the latter,—does not admit even of plausible proof.

where the historical foundation is known to us (as with Reuben, Simeon, Levi), we are led the more decidedly to the same conclusion, where such a foundation is not known to us, especially as it is only thus that we obtain a real understanding of the whole. *E. g.* it cannot otherwise be satisfactorily explained, why that announcement is made to Issachar in particular, which applied to other tribes also; and why with Naphthali prominence is given to the נתן אמרי שׁמר, ver. 21 (which is certainly to be understood according to the Masoretic reading[1]), since this might certainly be said of others also. This circumstance is important, inasmuch as it shows that the starting-point of the prophecy is not the tribes, but on the contrary the *persons*, from which point the tribes are exhibited to the view of the seer. This could not be the case in such a way were not this section authentic; and its partial obscurity also arises from the obscurity in which the circumstances of that age are involved; but how a later age could have had so much as a faint notion of them, it is impossible to see.

And as it is with the whole, so is it also with the separate parts. Ver. 18 can be understood only as it is authentic, forming, as it does, a genuine lyrical interruption: could this have been the imitation of a later period? Certainly as little as it can be pronounced an interpolation. A sentence of that kind, especially occurring in the middle of such powerfully epic language, can have arisen only from an immediate gush of feeling, flowing out of the fulness of deep emotions. We have such another in the mention of Reuben; xlix. 4 is quite of lyrical construction.[2] No other could have

1 [That is, the pointing of the common or Masoretic text, which gives the sense expressed in our English version. Bochart proposed a different pointing of the text, so as to bring out the rendering, "Naphtali is a spreading terebinth, putting forth boughs of beauty," which is countenanced by the LXX., and followed by Lowth, Pool, Michaelis, Herder, Dathe, Knapp, Geddes, Boothroyd, Horsley, &c.; but rejected in favour of the common translation by Patrick, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Lee, Schumann, and, as above, by Hävernick, for reasons which are best stated by Patrick.—Tr.].

2 "Patrem mihi videre videor—says Stähelin, Animadvv. in Jac. vaticin. p. 5—primogeniti adspectu gaudentem, deinde criminis ipsius memoria ira commotum, ita tamen ut ne in commotiore quidem animo non agnoscere possimus animum paternum: nam nonnisi invitus maledixit, ideo brevi tempore intermisso adjecit, עלית, *utique ascendit*, haud aliter ac si significare voluisset, se non injuriâ dira filio natu maximo imprecatum esse." On the contrary, it is ridiculous that one should attempt to give the verse an explanation from later political circumstances, as when Von Bohlen conjectures, p 447, that the tribe of Reuben latterly on some occasion made an attempt to seize the chief power, &c.

spoken thus of Jacob's first-born. It is also only in general terms that the loss of the birth-right is here spoken of; so that upon this declaration, which at the time was fully understood by Reuben, an evident advance is made in Deut. xxxiii. 6, where it is announced that he shall remain unimportant.[1] So also it is only from the circumstances of that time that we can explain how Joseph should appear here as נזיר אחיו, ver. 26; for it was only at that time that he was properly such, especially if we think of him as adorned with a diadem (נזר), according to the custom of the Egyptian grandees: Stähelin, l. cit. p. 27. Everything else of power and dominion that was afterwards displayed in Ephraim, was but a faint reflection of the dignity that was then united in Joseph's person, to which all his brethren bowed down in homage. The dignity of Judah, as the one who assumes precedence, in consequence of the three elder brethren losing their rights, is here described with traits of the most comprehensive nature. Neither his occupation of the first rank, as leader in the journey through the wilderness, nor the royal house that afterwards proceeded from him, is sufficient to embrace the whole of this description. His royal right is described as one that shall remain inviolate, and comprehend within it whole nations, being accompanied by the greatest blessings. This passage can neither have been written in the time of David; for then its juxtaposition with Joseph's dignity would be inexplicable (see Bleek, l. c., p. 33); nor in the subsequent period of the division of the kingdoms, for then certainly Judah's dominion was far from being so extensive a one; nor in the times of the Judges, for the delineation is far too ideal for that. Thus we are here also driven back to the epoch that is given by historical tradition. But to this we are led particularly by the way in which Simeon and Levi are here spoken of. In this case also, the immediate cause of the curse is their crime against Sichem. Both the sons are therefore made completely equal, as being allied in that deed. They are to meet with the same fate. The patriarch foresees in spirit only the dispersion of these tribes. That also takes place. He has no blessing for Levi: his priestly dignity is not yet thought of. We are here by no means involved in the dilemma (as V. Bohlen, p. 454, thinks) of being obliged either to deny the fulfilment of the

1 For in this sense only is the word מתי there to be taken (a subject of numbering, numerable = small in number); see Hitzig, on Isaiah, p. 132.

prediction, or to regard the dispersion of Levi as an unfortunate fate. *In itself*, indeed, Levi's lot stood on the same level as Simeon's —it was a calamity. The appointment of the tribe to the priesthood was a subsequent *accedens*, without which Levi would have remained in the same condition as Simeon. That here only the one side of his future lot is predicted, by no means does away with the subsequent divine arrangement and favourable turn given to it. Levi's good fortune did not consist at all in the division of the tribe; but in its exalted appointment to represent the nation in the sanctuary of Jehovah! It was not however granted to Jacob to announce that to him: Moses must first arise out of this line to announce his benediction to it, Deut. xxxiii. 9, ff. Simeon then is quietly passed over; for what the patriarch had announced to him remains unaltered. But now let one explain how such expressions could be used of Levi, subsequently to the establishment of that line as the tribe of priests! Or if one goes so far as to assign to the whole priestly tribe as such a far later origin, or to deny it any original title to reckon as a tribe, which Vatke does in defiance of all history; let him explain how any thing of this sort could obtain a general reception by the side of such blessings as those of Moses. This curse must indeed have been regarded as established on a far higher authority, if it could keep its ground in the midst of such presumptuous endeavours on the part of the priestly caste; but it would then have been impossible that it should be faithfully preserved in this form.[1]

Chap. l. presents us with a very exact picture of Egyptian manners and funeral solmnities, which is particularly fitted to afford us an insight into the author's wonderfully exact acquaintance with that country. Jacob being dead, Joseph commands *his servants, the physicians*, to embalm him. The persons to whom this duty belonged were men acquainted with the art, who were charged expressly with this business (τεχνῖται, τὴν ἐπιστήμην ταύτην ἐκ γένους παρειληφότες, Diod. Sic. i. 91), belonging probably to the inferior priesthood, the Pastophori,[2] who also practised medicine,[3] and therefore suitably designated here as *servants*. They are here called *physicians* (הָרֹפְאִים) with the same propriety, and as

1 See Sack, Apologetik, p. 232.

2 Comp. Creuzer, Commentt. Herod., p. 13. Bähr, ad Her. i., p. 681.

3 According to Clemens Alex. Comp. Creuzer, Symbolik i., p. 247, ff.

characteristically, as they were styled by the Greeks ταριχευταί.[1] The mourning or lamentation for the dead, and the funeral, the former as the preparation for the latter, appear closely conjoined.[2] The proper embalming lasts forty days, the whole time of mourning seventy days (l. 3.). The statements of the ancients also agree with this, as Diodorus, l. c., says, that more than thirty days were spent in the embalming (ἡμέρας πλείους ἢ τριάκοντα—according to other copies τετταράκοντα); according to Herodotus, they let the body lie altogether seventy days in mineral-alkaline salt, which was the case indeed in all the three kinds of embalming (ii. 86, 87, 88), after which lapse of time it was either immediately interred, or still farther filled with spices.[3] It is not Joseph himself that applies immediately to Pharaoh with the request, to be permitted to bury his father in Canaan; but he seeks first to win for himself the favour of Pharaoh's house, *i. e.*, the priesthood by whom Pharaoh was surrounded. This circumstance can hardly be explained by the mourning having hindered Joseph from applying (Esth. iv. 2);[4] for we have no definite knowledge as to whether the Persian custom existed in Egypt also, though, on other grounds, we should be very much disposed to doubt it. But it must be particularly kept in view here, that Egypt was full of cities of the dead, in which the mummies were carefully laid up.[5] It cannot fail to strike us as a remarkable thing, that the mummy, having been prepared according to the Egyptian rite, was now not interred in a manner accordant with that. As this interment of the dead was closely connected with the religious belief of Egypt, it may be very well understood that Joseph was obliged to act prudently in this matter. It is quite natural that he should here first put himself on a good understanding with the house of Pharaoh, the priesthood, and thus convey his petition through them to the king, who was bound to a strict observance of the priestly statutes. This also completely explains, why the Egyptians take part of course in the lamentation, and ac-

1 Creuzer, Commentt., p. 10, sq. On the medical art of Egypt, which was entirely subservient to the objects of the priesthood, see Heeren, p. 165, ff. Creuzer, Symb. i., p. 395.

2 ויבכו * * * * ויחנטו, l. 2, 3. θρῆνοι καὶ ταφαί, Herod. ii., p. 85.

3 The peculiarly Egyptian θήκη, in which the corpse was laid (Creuzer, Commentt. p. 67), is also mentioned by our document, xlix. 26, by a name that designates it well אורן, comp. the Arabic اران, Vullers ad Tarafae Moall. p. 39.

4 As Rosenmüller and Schumann suppose.

5 See Creuzer, Commentt. cap. ii., De primariis urbibus sepulcralibus per Ægyptum consecratis.

company the body as far as a place situated beyond Jordan, ver. 10; for the period of mourning lasted until the time of interment.[1] All Joseph's brethren pass over Jordan, and bury their father; the place of the mourning and that of the burial are therefore accurately distinguished.[2] In the latter the Egyptians could take no part at all, as it was not in agreement with their usages. The circumstance, however, thus becomes especially remarkable to the inhabitants of Canaan, and they give the place of mourning the characteristic name—*The mourning of the Egyptians;* for the mourning usages of that country were in general peculiar, and such as appeared singular to other nations.[3]

§ 23. CONTINUATION. CRITICISM OF THE HISTORY IN EXODUS. CHAPS. I.—XIX.

The farther that the history advances onwards, the more plainly do the traces of its internal truth appear; for the region of analogies now becomes more extensive, and criticism gains more certain positions. But at the same time we now encounter more zealous attacks, threatening to undermine the historical foundation of these accounts.

The present book commences with the description of Israel's condition in Egypt. The objection is immediately raised upon this, that our accounts should pass over the long period of that sojourn in utter silence.[4] This is a remark which, in the first place, is not pertinent here, as it is directed not so much against the historical character of the document, as against the historian's plan and object. Instead of saying that in this or the other connection, we ought to have solutions of our difficulties, the enquiry should rather have been made, whether such communications belonged to the plan of the writer of the history, and were agreeable to it; but we have already demonstrated the opposite of this, in a previous section (§ 6.). The question, therefore, which has to be proposed is this; seeing it is only the condition of the people that this historical work

1 Οἱ μὲν συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι πάντες καταπασάμενοι πηλῷ τὰς κεφαλὰς περιέρχονται τὴν πόλιν θρηνοῦντες, ἕως ἂν ταφῆς τύχῃ τὸ σῶμα. Diod. Sic. l. c.

2 Comp. Ewald, Komposit. der Genesis, p. 48.

3 Comp. Her. ii. 36: τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ἀνθρώποισι νόμος ἅμα κήδεϊ—Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ etc., ii. 85.

4 See De Wette, Beitr. p. 169.

is concerned with, does the author exhibit to us such a clear and certain view of that, as admits of historical verification?

But here again we light upon fresh objections. It is said that, from the brief and indefinite account in our book, we do not know the causes of these strange political measures pursued by the Egyptian kings; while that which has been adduced from Egyptian history relating to this matter is mere hypothesis.[1] With regard to this, we must take a view of Egyptian history, so far as it belongs to our subject, and examine more closely the series of Pharaohs, as presented to us by name in Manetho and upon the monuments. We must, for that purpose, go back to a period that is certainly very obscure, the period before Sesostris, whose age we are obliged to fix at the latest 1500 B.C.[2] That the age of Moses goes further back, falling into the time of Inachus (thus 1800 B.C.), is not only certain from the chronology of the Bible, but is also in agreement with a multitude of other testimonies from ancient authors.[3] Now the remarkable account of the expulsion of the Hyksos falls into the 18th dynasty of Manetho; and, according to Manetho, into the reign of the first king of that dynasty, called Amosis I., or Tuthmosis, at which time Julius Africanus also places the departure from Egypt, though Syncellus, contradicting him, places it somewhat later in the time of Amosis II., also of the 18th dynasty. While the chronological statements here are necessarily such that they can make no claim to complete exactness, and we must be satisfied if they are found to have only a general accordance; the greater is the importance that belongs to the information given by Manetho himself concerning the Hyksos, and especially concerning their expulsion. Much as has been said on this subject, it has yet always been made to give way very much to arbitrary hypothesis, without receiving a truly impartial examination in itself as an ancient Egyptian tradition. It required, however, only such an examination to recognise beyond dispute in the tradition of the Hyksos, the sojourn and departure of the Hebrews. The important passage of Manetho in Jos. con. Ap. i. p. 1039, begins thus: *ἐγένετο βασιλεὺς ἡμῖν Τίμαος ὄνομα.*

[1] See De Wette, p. 170. Von Bohlen, p. lxxix. sq.
[2] Comp. Heeren, ii. 2, p. 305. Keil, üb. d. Chron. p. 331.
[3] Comp. Perizonius, Origg. Bab. et Æg. ii. p. 362, sq.
[4] See Leo, Universal-Gesch. i. p. 94, 95.

Ἐπὶ τούτου οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ὁ θεὸς ἀντέπνευσε, καὶ παραδόξως ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μερῶν ἄνθρωποι τὸ γένος ἄσημοι καταθαρσήσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἀνεστράτευσαν, καὶ ῥαδίως ἀμαχητὶ ταύτην κατὰ κράτος εἷλον. That in this account we have the Egyptian exhibition of the incidents of the Israelitish immigration, can be disputed by no one: every circumstance agrees; the coming from the East, the despised shepherds, the possession of a province following without a struggle, the wonderful nature of the event—requires only the remark, that even in this introduction the authentic and antique complexion of the tradition is manifest. Manetho continues: *καὶ τοὺς ἡγεμονεύσαντας ἐν αὐτῇ χειρωσάμενοι, τὸ λοιπὸν τάς τε πόλεις ὠμῶς ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν θεῶν κατέσκαψαν. Πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις ἐχθρότατά πως ἐχρήσαντο, τοὺς μὲν σφάζοντες, τῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας εἰς δουλείαν ἄγοντες. Πέρας δὲ καὶ βασιλέα ἕνα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν, ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Σάλατις. Καὶ οὗτος ἐν τῇ Μέμφιδι κατεγίνετο, τήν τε ἄνω καὶ κάτω χώραν δασμολογῶν,* &c. If we look at these descriptions of the oppression to which the Egyptians were subjected, we shall readily find them explained, even with their hyperbolical colouring, by the view which the Egyptians would take of Joseph's measures, which are very plainly referred to in the particular circumstances of the imposition of tribute and religious opposition. Besides, the thoroughly Semitic name *Σάλατις* (comp. Gen. xlii. 6[1]) is a still more decided indication. Manetho then removes them to the Typhon-city of Avaris (comp. Jos. l. l. p. 1052), and represents Egypt as being for 511 years under the dominion of these Hyksos, a period by no means too strikingly at variance with the 430[2] years of the Bible, when we consider the uncertainty prevailing here in respect of statements of numbers. The name *Hyksos*, according to some, signifies *Shepherd-kings* (consequently Nomades, a nation following the patriarchal mode of life), according to others *Captives;* and Josephus has rightly reminded us that both significations are exactly suited to the Israelites, and allude perhaps to the history of Joseph himself (p. 1041.). But principal importance belongs to the circumstance, that, according to

1 [Where Joseph is designated "the governor הַשַּׁלִּיט over the land."]

2 [But the Hebrews sojourned in Egypt only for the *half* of that period, 215 years.—Tr.]

Manetho, this people went away with an astonishing force through the wilderness to Judea, where they founded a city named Jerusalem, which cannot be explained otherwise than of the Israelites. Manetho says, indeed, that according to some, they were *Arabians* (τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτοὺς Ἄραβας εἶναι). But that remark, with the view contained in it, has certainly been too hastily taken up by some[1] without qualification as an historical statement, especially as, according to another notice of Manetho's, they were ἀδελφοὶ φοίνικες (Creuzer, comm. Her. i. p. 192.)[2] The only argument that with any plausibility can be brought forward in opposition to the foregoing has been already well refuted elsewhere.[3] It rests on the fact that Manetho expressly distinguishes the Hyksos from the Israelites (in Jos. c. Ap. ii. p. 1052, sq.), placing at a far later epoch—that of the Trojan war—the departure of a horde of lepers under the conduct of a certain Asarsiph, or Moses, priest of Heliopolis. But the object of that statement which has been adopted from him by other authors, is plainly a polemical one directed against the Jews,[4] as is proved by the mention of leprosy. The chronological error shows how much the Egyptians were concerned to obliterate and remove the dishonour to which they were subjected in the period of the Hyksos. But the statement that the Israelites called to their aid the tribes of the Hyksos who had emigrated at an earlier time, and that, after devastating Egypt, they were beaten back along with these allies and driven into Syria, shows above all that the self-flattering tradition of the priests sought here to roll away the disgrace that Egypt had suffered from Moses, and to veil it with a web of fictions, that betray themselves as such by internal inconsistency, as Josephus has well pointed out.

With these accounts from Manetho are joined other testimonies

1 As Heeren, l. c. p. 116, ff.

[2 Our author's view of the identity of the Hyksos with the Hebrews—originally advanced by Josephus, and sustained by Perizonius and others—is now generally rejected. But recent writers, though united in rejecting that view, are quite at variance in their suppositions respecting the time of the Hyksos' invasion, and their nationality. Jahn (Heb. Commonw. c. i. § 6) regards them as Arabian *Amalekites*, of the same race as the Canaanites: Dr Kitto (Pict. Hist. of Palestine, vol. i. p. 85) again has a theory that they were identical with the *Philistines*, which seems improbable.—Tr.]

3 See Perizonius, l. cit. p. 378, sq. Comp. also Jablonski, Vocc. Ægypt, p. 346.

4 We may leave it undecided whether Manetho here gives us his own invention, which the circumstances of the time might certainly have led him to do, or whether he met with the tradition already existing in that form.

in reference to the monuments. Josephus (Ant. 2, 9) would regard the Israelites as the builders of the Pyramids. His view in fact deserves much more consideration than is commonly believed. The high antiquity of the Pyramids is evidenced by the conflicting statements on that point given by the Egyptians themselves (Diod. i. 64, Plin. H. N. 36, 12); and Herodotus's account of Cheops as the first builder of them may certainly be decidedly rejected, for the very reason that in that case we should have more certain information concerning them.[1] That the Israelites should have executed structures of this kind will appear the more likely, when we consider that the building of the cities mentioned in the Pentateuch comes within the last period of their stay, and certainly presupposes a still earlier oppression.[2] We are confirmed in this by the circumstance that the Egyptians in general appear to have employed foreigners for their huge structures, as is clear from the statements made by the ancients concerning the buildings, which Sesostris caused to be raised by prisoners taken in war (Diod. i. 56; Her. ii. 108); and we may leave the question out of view, whether we ought to explain by that the notice in Pliny l. cit.: "vestigia complurium inchoatarum exstant." It is of importance also to mark the district in which we meet with the Pyramids, in the neighbourhood of Memphis (Heeren. p. 74), and the building materials which according to Herodotus were required for them, were to be got in the neighbourhood of Goshen (Her. ii. 8, 124; Perizon. p. 444, sq.). This circumstance has continued to be the subject of perplexity even to the present time; and the similarity which they have been discovered to have to Ethiopic monuments[3] may certainly go to prove the hypothesis of Heeren that the Pyramids have an Ethiopic origin; provided it is confined to this, that the style of architecture leads to such a conclusion, without our deciding however anything by that, as to who must have executed those structures, but only who supplied the idea of them. Heeren also however rightly recognized (p. 118) that Herodotus' sketches of the kings and of the period to which the Pyramids owed their origin, must neces-

[1] See Perizonius, p. 489. Heeren, p. 118.

[2] Quid vero tanto temporis intervallo tot millia hominum perfecerunt, non reperimus nisi munitionem duarum vel trium urbium quae ab iis intra paucissimos annos facillime perfici potuit. Debuerunt etiam aliud quid maximae molis, laboris, temporis praestitisse quodque conveniens esset aliquot centenis millibus hominum longissimo et continuo tempore ad opus adactis. Perizonius, p. 441.

[3] See Heeren, ii. 1, p. 405; ii. 2, p 118, 198, ff. Ritter, Erdkunde i. p. 540.

sarily refer to the period of the Hyksos, as being an epoch to which the Egyptians gave principal prominence as a time of disgrace. To this effect is the remarkable passage in Her. ii. 128: *τούτους ὑπὸ μίσεος οὐ κάρτα θέλουσι Αἰγύπτιοι ὀνομάζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πυραμίδας καλέουσι ποιμένος φιλιτίωνος, ὃς τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἔνεμε κτήνεα κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ χώρια.* However obscure the name *φιλιτίων* here is, and however much the tradition appears here to have assumed a certain epic formation (see Bähr ad h. l.), yet the reference to the Israelites who once lived in Egypt cannot be overlooked.

It is interesting to observe the concurrence of the pictorial representations on the monuments with these accounts. Through the recent discoveries, in particular, it has been concluded, with great probability, that the reliefs on the great palace at Karnak represent the history of the expulsion of the Hyksos, and indeed in the very way that Manetho relates it: a proof how far the endeavour of ancient Egypt was carried, constantly to present in a lively manner to the people their famous history in the national version of it; and showing also that Manetho must rather be regarded as repeating the tradition of the priests, and not as the inventor of it. Here now the peculiar delineation of the nation, which is represented as vanquished, attracts our particular attention. They all have beards and long clothes, and their physiognomy is quite distinct from that of the Egyptians. They are evidently Nomades, who flee along with their herds into the woods and morasses. In addition the whole has a heterogeneous appearance, and seems to betray the infancy of the art.[1] We require only to add to this Heeren's conjecture, that they might be Arabians, to confirm still more their identity with the Israelites, which the preceding has made so probable.

After these accounts, we shall be in a condition to understand better the reason of the measures pursued by the Egyptian kings. The recollection of Joseph and his services was extinguished (Ex. i. 8), and had given place, therefore, to the ancient hatred to the shepherds of Goshen which was deeply founded in religion. We find expressed throughout in the Egyptian tradition, a branding of that epoch, when the Israelites found a favourable reception with the Pharaohs; and a concern on the part of the priests to maintain their

1 Comp. Heeren, ii. 2, p. 121, 263, ff.

national and religious peculiarities. Along with this we see a dread of insurrection, and of warlike inroads,[1] which, with a people at that time so martially disposed, and so soon to reach an epoch splendidly distinguished by warlike deeds, might easily turn into the tradition of conquering and driving out the shepherd-people.

This tradition, at the same time, confirms the increase of the Israelites to so considerable a multitude of people as we find them in the age of Moses. But to this our recent critics have paid so little regard, that they have rather sought to draw an argument thence for the mythical character of the narrative.[2] The number of the Israelites at the Exodus amounted to 600,000 men of war, which supposes the nation to have numbered two millions and a half individuals.[3] Now, while expressly regarding this extraordinary increase as a special divine blessing, and recognizing in it also, in surveying the history from a higher point of view, the undeniable working of Providence, which in this manner would cause the liberation of Israel to appear the more splendidly as a divine act; yet natural causes also admit of being stated as concurring to its production, and serving to explain the circumstance. The ample period of 430 years[4] must certainly be regarded in the first place. We must next take into the account the uncommon fruitfulness of Egypt, on which all the ancient authors are agreed, while they extol the peculiarly prosperous births of the Egyptian women.[5] This must especially be supposed to have been the case in the districts inhabited by the Hebrews, since there was there the fruitfulness of the ground in addition.[6] There is no force at all in the objection that so many men could not have found room there. In the time of Josephus, Egypt, exclusive of Alexandria, numbered seven millions of inhabitants (De B. Jud. ii. 16), and yet at that time the population of the interior must have been considerably diminished,

1 Ex. i. 10, comp. Schumann, De inf. Mos. in the Commentt. Th. ed. Ros. et Maurer ii. 1, p. 217.

2 See Hartmann, p. 440. Von Bohlen, p. lx.

3 See J. D. Michaelis on Exod. xii. 37. Süssmilch, Göttliche Ordnung u. s. w. ii. p. 337, ff. That there is in this no contradiction of Num. iii. 41, ff., as Von Bohlen thinks, has been well shown by J. D. Michaelis, De censibus Hebræorum, § iv. v.

4 [This certainly appears to be an error.—Tr.]

5 Comp. Strabo, xv. p. 478. Aristot. Hist. Anim. vii. 4. Plin. H. N. vii. 3. Seneca, Qu. Nat. iii. 25. Colum. De re rust. iii. 8. Maillet, Descr. i. p. 18. Schlosser, i. 1, p. 186, ff.

6 Comp. de la Roziere in the Descript. del' Eg. xx. p. 328.

if we compare the accounts of the ancients concerning Thebes in particular!

A contradiction has been pointed out in the measures of Pharaoh, who, on the one hand, will not let the people depart, and on the other attempts to extirpate them altogether.[1] A wretched misunderstanding! Pharaoh's object evidently was as much to make use of the Israelites for his own purposes, to make them labour as slaves and employ them usefully, as to guard against the danger that threatened him on their side. A total extirpation therefore is not to be thought of at all. Equal improbability has been charged on the mention of two midwives, which were certainly not sufficient for so large a number of people.[2] This charge would stand good, if it were only so in the text! But the king evidently wished to compass his end, in the first place, in a concealed way, by this method, which besides is quite accordant with the customs of the East.[3] Could he have assembled before him all the midwives? Must he not have first made the attempt with some of them, and striven to win them over to his measures? Must he not have proceeded so all the more with *Hebrew* midwives, which those here mentioned certainly were? And, on the other hand, does not the introduction of these women by name[4] afford a particular guarantee for the accuracy of the narrative? His first project not succeeding, the king tries a new method. This command also, in Exod. i. 22, is treated as improbable, because the Egyptians can have executed it only imperfectly, as is shown indeed by the great numbers of the multitude of the people at their departure. As if the absurdity of a measure did away with its reality! But what then would these critics say to similar measures on the part of other nations—to the conduct of the Lacedemonians towards the Helots, to that of Mithridates towards his Roman subjects,[5] to that of the Caliph Hakem to the Egyptians (Barhebr. Chron. x., p. 219), and a hundred similar cases in oriental history? But just because the king's order could be but

[1] So Bauer, Hebr. Gesch. i. p. 246.

[2] Bauer, p. 247. De Wette, p. 171. Hartmann, p. 441.

[3] See Rosenmüller, A. u. N. Morgenl. i. p. 255.

[4] How V. Bohlen can say that the names are invented to suit their profession (sic!) is incomprehensible, since the meaning of the names has no relation to it at all. What etymologies can this critic have been thinking of!

[5] See Cicero pro l. Manil. c. 3. Pro Flacco, c. 25, Valer. Max. ix. 2.

defectively executed, and in general because his plan was to effect a diminution, but by no means an extirpation, of the people; we can easily explain it as quite accordant with probability, that we should subsequently meet with the mention of so numerous a multitude of people.* We may also suppose with certainty that the Hebrews adopted every possible plan, to render the king's measure as ineffective as they could.[1]

The objections that have been brought against the earliest part of Moses' personal history, rest on the supposition of its being mythus, although the very analogies that have often been adduced of the birth and preservation of Romulus, Cyrus, and Semiramis, should have exhibited just the contrary, the want of similarity in this slight and simple history to those traditions. No one, for instance, will regard it as any thing better than a bold assertion, to affirm that the way in which Moses was rescued is inconceivable, because the daughter of the Egyptian king would not have ventured to do such a thing, &c. The contrary argument has here its full force, that it is impossible to see why a writer of fiction should have selected just this mode of his being rescued. De Wette, however, p. 174, ff., has also attempted to answer this question, by saying that the mythus is of etymological origin, arising from an endeavour to explain the name of Moses. But this view meets its refutation, when we remark that the etymology, if regarded strictly as such, is not correct, since משה cannot mean *extractus*. How then can such an argument be built upon it? In that case the inventor would certainly have given the mythus a different turn, for the remark referred to is one that would necessarily be made by every reader upon the passage. The name, however, is evidently Egyptian, for the child receives this name from an Egyptian princess, and the word finds a simple explanation in the Egyptian language, from which also the LXX. and others of the older authors, acquainted with that tongue, have explained it.[2] Our author explains the name by a fine paronomasia, and thus shows himself certainly to be well acquainted with the Egyptian language, without however betraying himself in any way as indulging in free invention. But the mode of explanation which

1 See Schumann, l. cit. p. 232, sq.

2 Comp. Schumann, l. cit. p. 261—266.

fixes on the etymologies as the reason and occasion of the myth, errs still farther; for in ii. 22 it finds such another case (De Wette, p. 176), though the name Gershom is quite correctly explained, the Hebrew form גֵּרְשֹׁם being simply turned into the Arabic גֵּרְשֻׁם, which only speaks for the authentic character of a narrative whose scene is laid in Arabia; and when De Wette in ch. iii. goes back to an etymology of the word סְנֶה from סְנֵה *a thorn* (p. 186), he falls into the same fault that he charges upon the natural meaning of this history; for there is nothing of it in the text.

It is thought strange that from ch. ii. 11 Moses does not appear as the adoptive son of the Egyptian princess, but as a powerful young Hebrew.[1] But we are expressly informed that Moses had gone back to his brethren from the royal court, as soon as he was grown up. Must he not here have again adopted their mode of life? But who could decidedly say what circumstances were the occasion of that return? The more probabilities that we have here, the less should suspicion be thrown on what is fact, but as little should we demand the express mention of a certain matter, which the author has not regarded as sufficiently important to specify it. Hence the expectation that Moses should have been received at a later time as a royal prince, is absurd;—or may we not suppose that Moses had surrendered those claims, and now wished to appear only as what he was, and what had now become his highest vocation, a Hebrew?

While the narrative describes the way in which Moses was called with extraordinary psychological accuracy (see § 12), and in this characteristic delineation cannot be invented—any more than Is. vi., Jerem. i., Ezek. i.—the account given of the conduct of Moses in the matter is particularly surprising. It is clear that the impartiality with which he is here portrayed cannot possibly have proceeded from a feeling which has been designated as a "triumph of pride for the prejudiced son of Abraham."[2] There is therefore no other resource but to fall back on the simple assertion, that Moses cannot have formed his resolution for the liberation of his countrymen in such a way as this,[3] *i. e.*, to decide dogmatically, instead of critically; for that very consideration which may form a ground of

1 See Hartmann, p. 444, ff.
2 Expressions of Hartmann's, p. 448.
3 See De Wette, p. 188, ff.

attack on the narrative, viz., the subjective character of the chief personage here, speaks in favour of it: the higher objective incitement applied to him, and his appointment, lie beyond the jurisdiction of criticism. In like manner, in the account that is given of the *miracles* wrought in Egypt, our attention is first drawn to the circumstance, as one deserving remark, that the narrative admits a part of them to have been imitated by the priests. Nothing similar to this occurs again in the Old Testament; and, while on that account we must banish altogether the idea of its being copied, we meet here on the other hand with an ancient mysterious magic,[1] whose compass and depth we are the less able to discover because of its antiquity. But how can such a statement be explained, which is an admission to a certain extent on behalf of the Egyptian priesthood, supposing that we have here to do with traditions and legends of a later date? Assuredly, self-interest would have dictated a different procedure.[2]

These miracles are certainly singular in their character of sublimity and power; but wherever we turn our gaze,—whether to the epoch of the Theocracy, as such,—to the disposition of a people degenerate, yet called to so high a destiny,—or to the obstinacy and defiant attitude of Egypt and her king; everywhere we find such peculiar circumstances, that with regard to the miracles also we should expect only the like peculiarity. Moses is the first instrument employed by God for the performance of miracles, which is a most significant circumstance in itself. Where the words of the Lord do not suffice, their sound dying away unheard, the deeds of the Lord speak in loud proclamation of his majesty. The hour of Israel's deliverance is made glorious by powerful testimonies from Jehovah; but still more glorious is that which is given by the removal of the bondage: this testimony outshines all the preceding, which are but the vestibule, the approach to that Holiest of all.

Absurd as it is to place these wonders under a purely natural point of view, which is quite opposed to the object of the narrator, and which, after all the exegetical perversions that can be adopted, by no means serves to explain them all; it is as incorrect, on the

1 לָטִים, Ex. vii. 11, 22, viii. 3, 14.—Compare with that the turn which Artapanus, in Euseb. Præp. Ev. ix. 27, gives the subject.

2 De Wette, p. 193, says it is quite a ridiculous contradiction to find the magicians, after the water had been previously changed to a red colour, here introduced as doing the same. But it is understood, of course, that this imitation took place after the subsequent removal of the plague, and was probably exhibited also on a smaller scale.

other hand, to overlook the natural points of connection which these plagues have with the natural condition of the country on which they are sent. In this there lies at the same time a consideration of particular force against the mythical treatment of the miracles, which would refer them purely to the domain of fancy. They are as little natural wonders, as they are merely invented and arbitrary wonders: the natural here stands in such close connection with the supernatural that the one bears and supports the other. Had the author purposed merely to give a poetical embellishment of the natural plagues of the country, he would hardly have made the Egyptian priests partly associates in bringing them down, and still less would he have added other things not belonging to them, such as the death of the first-born, and the circumstance of the district of Goshen remaining untouched; but as little are the wonders severed from all connection with natural relations, and on that account they are quite suited to the circumstances of the time.

What an impression it must have made upon the Egyptians, in the first place, to see that Jehovah's power was directed against what was not only of particular material utility, but also was most sacred in their eyes—the sacred water of the Nile, the sacred animals, the priesthood, ix. 11. Nothing that they have can escape the avenging and punishing hand of Jehovah. How accurately psychological is the fact that Pharaoh, when he sees that the art of the priests is exhausted, and that they themselves are obliged to acknowledge the finger of Jehovah, acquiesces, and even desires that the Israelites should sacrifice in the land (viii. 21, ff.); and again, the circumstance that there is no concealment of the fact, that the king convinced himself by messengers of the wonderful preservation of the land of Goshen, ix. 7. These are traits that testify the exact accuracy of the account, being just such as we should expect from a contemporary writer. But the order in which these wonders follow one another is especially worthy of remark in our investigation, for that order as little excludes a natural mode of considering them, as such a mode on its part is by no means alone sufficient to explain them completely. The water which has been destroyed, and made putrid, especially by the dying of the fish, must have produced, as a natural consequence, a multitude of vermin; and so in like manner the air, being contaminated by the dying of the frogs (viii. 10), must again on its part have brought

a multitude of other kinds of vermin, and with that again the destructive murrain of the cattle must be connected, and by all that had preceded the loathsome disease (ix. 9, ff.) would be produced. And in the destruction of everything that remained to be destroyed by the hail and the locusts, there is also evident a close connection with what happened before, though in this instance the physical causal conjunction is more removed from view. But these miracles also have their correlative conditions, founded in the physical nature of the country, no less than the darkness which at last covered the land.[1] Taken altogether, the total impression produced by them must evidently have been a powerful one: Jehovah, in opposition to all worship of nature, exhibited himself in them as the supreme and only ruler of nature in the entire circle of its active energies. Hence Eichhorn's question here still stands good, though proceeding in him from a false method of explaining away what was miraculous: "Had the proceedings of Moses with Pharaoh been recorded simply from tradition, by an Israelite, who was not accurately acquainted with Egypt by personal experience,—by one who had not been a witness of those terrible natural occurrences; could he well have been in a condition to give so exact a narrative, agreeing with the natural history of Egypt even to the smallest minutiæ?"[2]

There is in addition to this among other things a remarkable circumstance, which refers to a primitive Egyptian usage. The symbolical procedure employed by Moses, ix. 8, ff., is striking, and has never yet been satisfactorily explained. It is, however, made completely intelligible to us by a statement of Manetho in Plutarch. De Is. et Osir. p. 380: *καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ἑιλιθυίας πόλει ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους κατεπίμπρασαν, ὡς Μανέθων ἱστόρηκε, Τυφωνίους καλοῦντες καὶ τὴν τέφραν αὐτῶν λικμῶντες ἠφάνιζον καὶ διέσπειρον.* In respect to this we may leave it undecided how far this statement should be connected with the residence of the Hyksos, a conclusion which there is much to favour:[3] here we have only to do with the striking *rite* mentioned in the notice, which was certainly an ancient mode of expiation, indicating purification, which in antiquity was often symbolized by ashes.[4] We

[1] Comp. Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterthumsk. iii. p. 219, 221, 225.

[2] Einleit. § 435, a. p. 254.

[3] Comp. Tablonski, Panth. Æg. ii p. 68, sq. Creuzer, Symbol. i. p. 354, ff.

[4] V. Spencer, De legg. rituall. l. iii. diss. 3. c. 1.

shall thus understand the entire significance which the procedure had for the Egyptians, inasmuch as a rite which they regarded as sacred in the sense referred to, was here followed by the contrary effect, pollution, as is so expressively indicated by our text.[1] We have at the same time to observe, that this usage belonged to an age which was decidedly one of primitive antiquity, so that not only is its existence disputed by Herodotus, though indeed incorrectly (ii. 45), but even Manetho represents it as having already fallen into disuse under king Amosis.[2] Hence we here meet with a knowledge of Egypt, which we should by no means expect from a foreigner, and as little from a later author.

The influence by which the opponents of the historical truth of the narrative have been swayed, in the case of these miracles, is very clearly displayed in De Wette. He incessantly repeats the assertion, that, if we would retain any degree of "probability" at all, we must give up the previous announcement and the performance of them by Moses, and their cessation upon his intercession; that it is "improbable" that the land of Goshen remained unharmed, and that the death of all the first-born is "quite incredible." Probability may be opposed to probability, and such an assertion does not properly express anything at all; how from the idea of improbability we arrive at that of incredibility, is still less clear; nor is it any clearer why the former should be affirmed of the one wonder, and the latter of the other; but it is evident on what supposition here again the "incredibility" rests, so that to whoever regards that supposition as invalid, the whole argument is quite devoid of force. Bare assertion here can hardly be raised to the level of absolute objective truth.

Several attacks have been made upon the way in which the rite of the Passover is said to have been introduced. The mythical fiction, it seems, is here very plainly discoverable, and the whole must be a very late attempt to explain the origin of the ceremony, and to refer it to the Mosaic period.[3] It is thought, in the first

1 As it is remarked, that even the priests, on whom cleanliness was so strictly binding (Her. iii. 37), were smitten with the boils; ix. 11.

2 Κατέλυσε—τὸν τῆς ἀνθρωποκτονίας νόμον Ἄμωσις, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Μανεθώς. Porphyr. De Abstin. ii. 55. Euseb. Præp. Evang. iv. 16. The only additional remark that we shall make here, is on the opposite Egyptian tradition of the leprosy of the Hebrews, adduced above: what connection it has with this fact may, however, be left out of view.

3 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i., p. 202, ff.; V. Bohlen, p. cxxxix., ff.; Vatke, Bibl. Th. I.

place, that in the later laws relating to the Passover, traces have been discovered of a simpler and therefore more original observance [*Cultus*], which in the account in Exodus also still partially betrays itself, but was subsequently very much enlarged in its significance and extent. It has accordingly been supposed, that the Passover was originally a harvest-feast, a feast of the first-born, at which at first only unbloody offerings, but subsequently bloody offerings also were presented; or, again, that it was a spring-time feast, celebrating the entry of the sun into the sign of the ram, on which account also an animal of that kind was sacrificed, symbolizing the triumph of the sun over winter, and his renewed strength.

The supposition, therefore, is that its original signification at any rate was that of a *festival of nature*, with which the *ethical* signification only came to be associated as a later supplement. We must here express surprise, that the former idea should be represented so unconditionally as the original one, and the latter be regarded as its result. Now it is the reverse in all ethnic ordinances of worship, where regard to the ethical element of the religion has been followed by giving it support in nature, and even by its issuing in nature; so that the whole of the worship of nature can be understood only as a subsequent formation, an apprehension of the ethical in the lower sphere of the natural. The natural is in this relation not a productive thing, but a thing produced, and in its particular form is to be referred to the religious sentiment; but the form is a thing fixed by a higher impulse, and nature in general is itself only the form, symbol, imprint, and reflection of a higher original. But if among the Hebrews every feast, and their whole system of worship, are decidedly penetrated by such an ethical and deeply religious element,—what justifies us here in determining all at once on the existence of such an irregularity? Farther, how shall we explain the circumstance, that all the laws laid down for the feast of the Passover after the first celebration of it, by no means point out its origin, but presuppose the feast as instituted and well established? To take up the opinion that these laws again are also presented to us in a later revision, is manifestly most arbitrary; we have thus anew to do with falsified documents. In

p. 486, ff.; George, Die älteren Jüd. Feste, p. 85, ff., 222, ff. Comp. also Baur on the original meaning of the Paschal feast, and circumcision, in the Tübinger Theol. Zeitschr. 1832, H. i., p. 40, ff.

such a state of things, who can presume to pronounce a decision as to what is original and what derived? But above all, is it possible that from such a hypothetic original, such an idea of the historical origin of the feast could be formed, as we meet with in Exod. xii. 13? For, according to the view of our opponents, the Passover originally occupied quite a natural position in the series of the other so-called feasts of nature; how then did it of a sudden come to be torn out of its position, which was quite a natural one, so as to be assigned a place so very peculiar previous to the institution of all the other feasts? It could not possibly in this way receive *explanation*—yet this is hypothetically assigned as the cause of the fiction—but the obscurity and confusion would only have been increased. Besides, there is an essentially new idea in the first Passover, which does not appear again afterwards, and indeed according to the appointments recorded in Exodus itself, ought not to appear again. The first Passover is a sacrifice, presented to Jehovah as an atonement, in consequence of which his favour is displayed towards Israel, while every thing that comes in hostile collision with the Theocracy,—here represented by Egypt's first-born,—falls a victim to his justice. This first sacrifice is also quite of a peculiar kind: it is the streaking of blood upon the houses, that here very peculiarly represents the atonement. This sacrifice has a meal conjoined with it, likewise of a peculiar kind, and it is only this meal that remains and is celebrated as a memorial-sign (זִכָּרוֹן, comp. Ex. xii. 14; Deut. xvi. 3) in future. Now, it is difficult to perceive how one should have arrived at the first-mentioned idea from that just specified, while the former decidedly appears as a product of the latter.

But the principal appeal is made to the want of internal connection, which is said to prevail in the narrative of Exodus. We, on our part, have therefore to show that such a law could be given only at this time. The solemn epoch of the departure from Egypt required especially to have the significance that belonged to it recognized. This month must therefore form the commencement of the year. That the reckoning in the Pentateuch is always dated from this month, is known; but there are also as well traces occurring in it that point us to the very ancient existence of a commencement of the year coincident with harvest,[1] which also serves to explain

[1] Comp. Ideler, Handb. d. Chron. i. p. 491, ff. Winer, Reallex. i. p. 627.

how this latter mode of reckoning could again find an entrance during the Exile. Must it not also be regarded as probable that the Egyptian reckoning of time[1] (even as the Babylonian during the Exile) exercised an influence at that time upon the Hebrews, and was adopted by them? This notice can all the less have had its origin subsequently to the Exile (as George, p. 91, will have it), as it then occurred to no one to doubt about the ecclesiastical commencement of the year, which, as is well known, still formed the date of reckoning even in the period of the Maccabees. It is precisely this remark that transfers us so completely to the standing-point of that age (viz., of the Exodus), that only by that age can we explain it. A new epoch was now to commence for Israel:—with this declaration is naturally connected the second, which shows how that epoch is to be celebrated. The idea of the atonement very naturally is here brought forward first: annexed to the sacrifice follows the mode of the sacrificial meal, and then the signification of this atoning sacrifice (ver. 3–13.). Nothing but great prejudice could lead one to assert that the connection is here interrupted (George, pp. 92, 93[2]); the whole theory of sacrifice must then be assailed in general, and the superfluousness of the rite be maintained, as *e. g.* Vatke does, in which case, indeed, a theocratic point of view can no longer be spoken of. Or if the destruction of the first-born be pronounced untrue *à priori*, the Passover also must certainly have a mythical character; and thus this latter assertion also rests on a mere empty supposition. To the significant command of the sacrifice is very naturally annexed the notice, that it was to retain its importance not merely for the present, but also for the future (ver. 13–20.). It is certainly of consequence here to understand the theocratic importance of that event, and of the rite connected with it, in order to perceive why so permanent a memorial feast was here commanded. But, on the other hand, it is also clear that this command must have possessed importance in reference to that age; for it showed Israel, on their leaving Egypt, to what they were called; their de-

1 See upon it Ideler, l. c. p. 124, ff.

2 This writer asserts, among other things, that there is a contradiction between Ex. xii. 9 and Deut. xvi. 7; for according to the one passage, the paschal lamb was to be roasted, according to the other to be boiled. But this rests on a misunderstanding of the verb בָּשַׁל, to which בָּאֵשׁ may be supplied as well as בַּמַּיִם. The passage in Deuteronomy thus plainly refers back to the more precise definition in Exodus, and not *vice versa*, as George thinks.

liverance was nothing little or insignificant in the eye of God: as its celebration was to be commemorated even to the most distant generations, the people must have seen in that an indication of the great destiny which the Lord had in view for them at that moment; and their gaze was elevated from the present to the future.[1] Farther, it is also to be considered, that here it is only the eating of the Passover in their houses that is spoken of, and a holy assembly (מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ xii. 16), a circumstance that quite transports us to a time when as yet they had no sanctuary. How much artful revision and reconstruction must have been employed, supposing a later author transferred himself to this standing-point!

It is quite in order that Moses should now give more exact directions as to how the people should perform the ceremony of consecrating their houses with the blood; nor, along with this, is it omitted to inculcate upon the people that they should maintain the remembrance of that act; they were faithfully to inform their children of it (xii. 21—28.). This again is quite agreeable to the state of things at that time. There follows next an historical statement of the punishment inflicted on Egypt's first-born, and of Israel's deliverance, with their hurried departure from Egypt (ver. 29—42.). Here also objections have been made. In the first place, it is treated as a contradiction that, according to xii. 11, the Israelites must already have been in a condition of readiness for travelling, and yet, ver. 39, they were so taken by surprise, that they were obliged to leave Egypt thus hurriedly. It agrees ill with this objection, what De Wette (ii. p. 202) maintains, that the hurried departure of a whole nation in one night is impossible. It follows, therefore, from this last assertion, that the Israelites must be regarded as previously on their departure: now this also is expressly said, since some days before (xii. 3) they were told to be ready for the journey. Yet no one will be surprised that, with so great a

[1] It is incomprehensible how one can urge that xii. 17—"for on this very day I lead your hosts out of Egypt"—points to a late epoch, when it is this very epoch that is spoken of, and that therefore it was of late composition (George, p. 95.). So also this learned man is wrong in thinking that Deuteronomy contains only a command in reference to the feast of the seventh day, but Exodus to that of the first and the seventh. That the first day's feast also is understood in Deuteronomy, is clear from xvi. 1, where it is just the beginning of the feast that is intended; only briefly stated, indeed; and the closer definition concerning the seventh day is purely supplementary. From the passage in Deuteronomy, taken *singly* and in itself, no definite idea whatever can be formed of the feast: we are thus necessarily referred to the earlier statement.

multitude, the departure must have been in haste. Accordingly, there results from those very objections the correct view of the fact. Yet it is also said that it is a contradiction, that in xii. 8 the eating of the unleavened bread is commanded, while this circumstance afterwards results of itself from the hasty departure; comp. Deut. xvi. 3. How is there any real contradiction in this? It was precisely in accordance with the divine will that they should eat the unleavened bread, which was then rendered necessary also by the circumstances in which they were placed. But the reason why the command was given just in that place concerning the unleavened bread, was because of its higher reference to the Passover as a sacrifice. How this point must gain additional importance from that circumstance being associated with it, is clear; and hence also the appellation of the feast as חג המצות becomes intelligible to us, which necessarily required such a circumstance to make it so. But as to the additional general objection that at that unsettled period Moses cannot have been thinking of the future continued celebration of the feast in Canaan, it is here in so far correct as it follows thence that all the appointments concerning it could not be given immediately in this place—and this also is actually the case;—but it is false, if we are with this required to suppose a total overlooking of this future appointment; for that would be as much as to say that the Lawgiver himself knew nothing of the destiny of his own nation, but only acted at random, thus setting the peculiar character of Moses himself altogether aside.

After the historical account of the feast of the Passover, there follow in addition two commandments that are essentially connected with the former injunctions. They are consequent on what goes before, and throw light in turn upon it. In the first place the feast was specially a Hebrew, a theocratic feast; this had been clearly exhibited in the destruction of the first-born of the Egyptians: it is therefore quite accordant with the circumstances, that a command follows, as to who alone could properly take a part in the celebration of it; a new Torah must be introduced for foreigners, which is the more to be expected here, as Egyptians were certainly to be found among the people (xii. 43—51.). Next, there results thence a sacred character for the first-born of the Hebrews, as those who were spared (xiii. 1, 2.). Here also it is to be remarked that, in the present passage, that sacredness is as yet established only in

general. It was a point that required to be taken notice of as much because of what went before, as for the sake of subsequent appointments. From this fundamental principle arose the other appointment of the redemption of the first-born (xiii. 11, ff.). This, however, could not be properly understood, unless the significant character which this feast possessed for all futurity were recognized: hence this is again inculcated (ver. 3—10.). The redemption of the first-born again is here stated with so little of detail, nothing but its general principle being laid down, that we find ourselves anew on the standing-point of the commencement of the legislation. That George should conclude from the forms of expression in Ex. xiii. 9—16, cognate with those in Deuteronomy, that our fragment is later than that in Deuteronomy (p. 106), is strange, for it by no means admits of being proved, that the meaning which the expression afterwards bears, relating to what is sensible, belongs to it here.

But the signification that is given of the name פֶּסַח is considered as the chief difficulty in the narrative of Exodus. This is said to have a much more suitable reference to the departure from Egypt, or to the feast of the Spring (*transitus sc. solis*); but the forced nature of the signification here given is said to be plainly shown by this, that the verb has the sense of *to spare* only when joined with the prep. עַל. But both a comparison of the related verb פָּצַח, and also the analogy of the Arabic فسح, and the Syriac cognate shows, that the fundamental meaning of פסח cannot possibly be *transire*; for how then could those cognate verbs have their meaning in any way derived from it? The radical meaning is rather *laxare, laxationem praebere,*[1] *to deliver* and *protect*, whence results the sensible idea—*amplo diductoque passu ingressus est;* hence פסח also means *to halt, he lame*, and then takes the wider meaning *transivit*, whence תִּפְסַח, *Place of passage.* Thus the relation in which the word stands to עָבַר with עַל in the sense of *to spare* is precisely the reverse, inasmuch as that signification is in the former the original, and in the latter the derived one. It then becomes clear that פסח, even when not construed with עַל, may signify *to spare.* Thus our narrative justifies itself in every respect as accredited history. It is felt, how-

[1] Comp. Schultens, ad Prov. p. 350, sq. Rosenmüller, ad Bochart. Hieroz. i. p. 630, ed. Lips.

ever; by our opponents how much must be conceded, if the ancient institution and celebration of the Passover be true; the circumstances conjoined with it must then be admitted as having no less a claim to credibility; and their aversion to the miraculous in history is too strong for them to adopt this opinion.

Following the Hebrews farther on their march through the wilderness to the Red Sea, we find the line of march very exactly stated. The stations are Succoth, Etham, and Pihahiroth. The first is unknown to us; of the second it is highly probable that we should understand by it the so-called Bir Suez, where the Red Sea describes a curve, and the wilderness appears to terminate. The notice in Ex. xiii. 20 is therefore one that admits of being explained only by local inspection on the part of the author: the spot is even at the present day a usual resting-place of the caravans.[1] In this it is farther surprising, that, according to these statements, the Hebrews must have turned northwards to Colsum, and have passed through the Red Sea there. By modern discoveries it has, however, been ascertained beyond dispute, that the gulf formerly extended higher up towards the north, and has subsequently retreated farther to the south.[2] The statement in xiv. 2 is equally exact: "they encamped before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, before Baal-zephon, over against which they encamped on the shore of the sea:" in reference to which we have only to wonder, that instead of recognizing in this the accuracy of the narrative, the statement itself has been thought a strange one,[3] which is certainly an involuntary confession, that our old author knew far more of Egyptian geography than his modern opponents do.

We certainly also meet with astonishing facts in these narratives. It need not surprise us after what goes before, to see Jehovah now, who had so graciously taken up the cause of his people, at the head of them as their leader through the wilderness. After all the promises that had been given to Israel by their God, we may expect nothing else but what is great and glorious; the contrary would signify that Jehovah had abandoned his people; the deliverance from Egypt would then be an incredible fact. Thus the one thing bears out and verifies the other. But the more that the mind

1 Comp. Burckhardt, Reise nach Pal. ii. p. 766. Rosenm. Alterthumsk, iii. p. 257, ff.
2 Comp. Rosenmüller, l. c. p. 263, ff. Ritter, Erdkunde ii. p. 232, ff., 1st ed.
3 See Von Bohlen, l. c. p. lxvii.

of the people, sunk in material things, required spiritual incitement and preparation, the more must regard be had to this condition which they were in, and the more must the gracious condescension of God be testified by deeds such as would make their way and prove impressive to minds so rude, elevating them also at the same time and making them susceptible of higher impressions. Hence when we see the glory of Jehovah here displayed in a pillar of cloud and fire, the circumstance may remind us of the oriental custom, to carry poles with fire before the host or caravan, which afford guidance in the day-time by their smoke, and in the night-time by the light ;[1] which, however, by no means explains the miracle itself, but only proves its connextion with a certain custom, as an indication that nothing is too mean for the Divine condescension to employ and to consecrate, as a means for the accomplishment of the highest object. But as this very custom appears not to have been without a higher significance in antiquity,[2] it is also by no means without meaning that Jehovah expressly professes these to be symbols of his holy and glorious being.[3] This is the higher aspect of the symbol, and its proper pædagogic character is displayed in these two references : as the living God in all his condescension to man constantly lifts man up to himself, by making himself known to man, and leading man in turn to the acknowledgment of Him. In a similar manner the miraculous passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea has its point of connection with nature which our author also by no means conceals,[4] (Ex. xiv. 21.). The supposition of a purely natural occurrence indeed is no more sufficient here than in Josh. ch. iii. But the very circumstance that the author equally refrains from being silent as to the display here given of Divine Omnipotence, and from omitting candidly to mention the natural means which that Omnipotence employed, is a pledge of the truth of the miracle, even apart from its farther connection with this theocratic history. Besides, the full historical accuracy of this history is confirmed by several incidents and statements

1 Comp. the expositors on Ex. xiii. 21, 22.

2 Comp. Clem. Al. Strom. i. c. 24, p. 418. Potter. Creuzer, Symb. i. p. 777. See *my* Commentary on Daniel, pp. 72 and 242.

4 " Trajecti ab Israelitis—maris rubri historia sic est descripta, ut hâc in re extraordinariam providentiam agnoscere oporteat: at in eadem tamen causis naturalibus sive ventis vehementioribus qui aquas pellerent, usum esse Deum, ipsa rei relatio discrte declarat." Pareau, De Mythicâ Int. p. 308.

occurring both in it and elsewhere. 1. That the Egyptian king led out a warlike expedition against the Israelites, finds its confirmation in Manetho's account of *conflicts* with the Hyksos, though he indeed has given the fact in a version that is more honourable to the Egyptians (see above). We have here only to take a closer view of the way in which this expedition is described in Exodus. Mention is made of war-chariots, which are evidently regarded as the most important part of the army, and farther of chosen war-chariots (רכב בחור), and of the array being led by the king in his own person. All these circumstances are confirmed by the monuments and the writers of antiquity as Egyptian customs. The Pharaohs everywhere appear on the monuments as valiant warriors, heading their armies in person; the art of war among the Egyptians recognizes principally only chariots and infantry; but how numerous were the former, and how closely attached to the person of the King as commander, is plain not only from Homer's statement concerning Thebes, but also the account of Diodorus, that in the valley of the Nile from Memphis to Thebes there stood 100 royal stalls with 200 horses in each.[1] 2. The song annexed to the historical account (Ex. xv.) completely confirms the fact. The supposition would be absurd, that the song first arose at a later period out of the embellished version of the fact; for no poem has such an origin, but this very song would then be the embellishment of the fact. It would, however, be quite as strange if we were to suppose the historical account copied from the song; for then the appearance of both original and copy here close beside each other would be in the highest degree surprising, and would have an utterly abnormal appearance. Thus the song cannot be taken otherwise than as a contemporary composition, and the whole of its antique poetry, with the imitation of that in the later Psalms, evidences this clearly. The reasons also that are given for the supposed spuriousness of the song are weak. It is thought partly too long, and partly too much marked by a love of the marvellous. The former assertion is contradicted by a multitude of much longer Temple psalms, and as relates to the delivery of our hymn, it is also clear, that but very little of it was sung in chorus (xv 21), so

1 Comp. Heeren, ii. 2, p. 351, ff. This also serves as an answer to Hartmann's question, How could the king have "conjured up" so large an army in so few days? (p. 458).

2 See De Wette, l. c. p. 216, ff., and comp. Hartmann, p. 742.

that it cannot exactly be charged with a want of simplicity.[1] The second assertion, however, is only a result of the view that regards the occurrence itself as bearing a marvellous, and therefore unhistorical, character; and, as such, it is a *petitio principii*. But the reference to the Temple in ver. 13, is also urged, as well as that the writer towards the end speaks of the Israelites in the third person. But as to that reference, it is so general that we have here only the idea of a mountain set apart for the divine honour, and consecrated as the habitation of Jehovah; an expression, which in the mouth of Moses should surprise us the less, as the whole system of laws in its ceremonial part relates to such a definite sanctuary of Jehovah, and we must therefore unquestionably attribute to him such a previous knowledge of the Divine counsel. The change of person, however, is so frequent in poetry, and is here so well accounted for by the turn in ver. 16, that only prejudice can draw such a conclusion from it. In a multitude of the Psalms the singer's circle of view is enlarged in this manner, and gives a more objective character to his language. 3. There is besides another foreign tradition, independent of our history, which was preserved among the dwellers by the Red Sea, relating to the miraculous retreating of the sea. We must certainly take the account that Strabo and Diodorus give of this, as a popular tale arising out of the event we are treating of, of which it affords a remarkable confirmation.[2]

We must here say one word more of the assertion, that the passage was impossible because of the nature of the Red Sea itself.[3] It is certainly not probable that the place of passage can have lain considerably to the south of Suez, partly because of the coral-reef that is found there, and partly because the geographical statements of the Pentateuch itself are in favour of a place lying farther to the north. There however the character of the ground is quite suitable. Recent discoveries have made us acquainted with the remarkable fact, that the ancient depressed bed of the Red Sea still extends to the length of 90,000 paces, and an average breadth of from 18,000 to 22,000 paces northwards, into the centre of the Isthmus, as far as the ruins of the Serapeum.[4] This bed is now

[1] See Vater, in his Comment. ii. p. 57.

[2] Comp. Clericus, De maris Idum. traject. in his Commentary, p. 619. See also Trogus Pompeius in Justin xxxvi. 2: Artapanus in Euseb. Pr. Ev. ix. 27.

[3] See in particular V. Bohlen, p. lxxxii. sq.

[4] See Ritter, l. c. p. 232.

"covered by a singular layer of *recent soil*, composed of masses of sand, chalk, and salt, with strata of clay and mud, and quite white with a crust of salt," &c. (Ritter, p. 233.).[1] Now when besides sea-water is to be found beneath this layer, and every thing here indicates a prolongation of the Arabian gulf at a former period, it is strange to seek to decide that the Israelites could not have passed through here, because of the bottom of the sea and its peculiar nature; while yet we merely know the present condition of the locality, a locality that still furnishes in general many unsolved enigmas, and are certain only of thus much, that its present condition was not its condition at that time.

If we follow still farther the information given in this book concerning the journies of the people on the other side of the Red Sea, while much certainly still remains for us to know concerning the physical and geographical character of that remarkable peninsula, which is now called Bar al Tor Sina; yet recent careful investigations have only served, partly to afford excellent explanations of the accounts given by Moses, and partly to verify them. Observe only with what accuracy Burckhardt, who was certainly as unprejudiced as he was careful and conscientious, was able to ascertain his position according to these accounts. "From Ayun Musa to the Well of Howara—he writes, ii. p. 777—took us 15¼ hours' journey. With regard to this distance, it is probable that this is *the wilderness of three days' journey* through which, according to the Scripture narrative, the Israelites went immediately after their passage through the Red Sea, and at the end of which they came to *Marah*."[2] As it is the journey of a whole nation, changing its residence, that is in question, we may reasonably suppose that it lasted for three days; and the bitter well of Marah, the water of which was sweetened by Moses, *answers exactly to Howara*.[3] This is the usual way to Mount Sinai, and was therefore most probably that which was chosen by the Israelites on their departure from Egypt; that is, admitting what Niebuhr with good reason conjec-

1 Concerning the origin and formation of these salt-lakes, however, geologists are not agreed. Comp. Ritter, p. 234, ff.

2 Comp. Ex. xv. 22, 23 (Num. xxxiii. 8.).

3 "The water of the well of Howara is so bitter that men cannot drink it, and even camels will not, unless they are very thirsty," says Burckhardt. Comp. with this the almost verbal accordance of Ex. xv. 23.

tures, that they passed the Red Sea in the neighbourhood of Suez. There is no other road by the way from Suez to Mount Sinai, that would amount to three days' journey; there is also on the whole of this coast, as far as Ras Mohammed, no other well that is quite bitter. Complaints like those which the Israelites, accustomed to the sweet water of the Nile, made of the bitterness of the water here, may be heard daily from Egyptian Bedouins and peasants, travelling in Arabia. Accustomed from their youth up to the excellent water of the Nile, there is nothing which they miss so much in foreign lands: there is also no nation in the East so readily sensible of the want of good water as the present natives of Egypt. Importance also attaches to the fact, of which Niebuhr (Beschr. v. Arab. p. 403), as well as Burckhardt, informs us, that notwithstanding all their enquiries they could not learn from the Bedouins that there were any means which persons employed to sweeten the taste of the water. Though such have been discovered among other nations,[1] this statement still proves with how much truth our book informs us, that God showed Moses a tree or a kind of wood (עֵץ) for sweetening the water; and it is at the least very remarkable that no such natural means are known to the inhabitants of those districts.

Three hours' journey to the south of Howara, we come upon the valley of Wadi Ghirondel, in which our writers of travels unanimously recognize the *Elim* of the Bible, which is still a very convenient and usual halting-place for travellers. For abundant water is still found in that quarter, and abundant shade in the richly wooded valley.[2] Then follows the wilderness of Sin "between Elim and Sinai" (xvi. 1), and our travellers recognize in that Wadi Asscheik, to which the circumstances also fit exactly (Burckhardt,

1 Comp. Michaelis, N. Orient. Bibl. v. p. 51, ff. Rosenmüller, A. u. N. Morgenl. ii p. 28.

2 Comp Ex. xv. 27, and with that Shaw, Journey, p. 272. Pococke, Description of the East, i. p. 234, ff. Niebuhr, l. c. p. 403. Burckhardt, p. 779; the last of whom says —"that there are no *twelve wells* now to be found in Ghirondel cannot be brought as a proof against the conjecture that has been proposed, for Niebuhr says that his companions here, if they only dug a little, obtained water; and when I travelled through it, there was water there in abundance. Indeed, in every fertile valley of Arabia, water is very easily found on digging, and in that way wells very easily spring up, which, however, are also soon choked again by the sand." Comp. with this the levity of Von Bohlen's decision, p. lxvii.: "Elim, where in *genuine mythical fashion* there were twelve wells and seventy palm-trees."

p. 797, ff.). Von Bohlen indeed represents the author as here guilty of the absurdity of intending the wilderness of *Pelusium* (p. lxvii.), an opinion that certainly does not now require any detailed confutation (comp. only Num. xxxiii. 10, 11.).

We now come to the occurrences narrated in Ex. xvi., xvii.,—the manna, the quails, the water from the rock, the victory over the Amalekites. As relates to the miraculous sustentation of the people, those who deny it, entangle themselves again in the greatest difficulties. For De Wette's remark—"that the Israelites were not starved in the wilderness, the sequel shows: how they appeased their hunger, what they boiled and roasted, we cannot tell"—is a mere evasion of the difficulty, no more satisfactory than Eichhorn's supposition that the Israelites dispersed into separate hordes, and that only their chiefs remained together.[1] Since the whole peninsula of Sinai, according to Burckhardt's estimation, contains no more than a population of 4,000 souls, and even this number frequently suffers want in years of drought, it must remain a matter difficult of comprehension how the Hebrews could support themselves there for forty years.[2] This very fact also is then brought by our opponents as an argument against the truth of this account,[3] without seeing that it is precisely this circumstance that renders necessary an extraordinary interposition of Divine Providence for the preservation of the people. If we likewise take into account the stiff and obstinate disposition of the people, as here depicted to us, how shall we explain the fact of their accommodating themselves so as to continue their residence in the wilderness, unless they were enabled to do so by a miraculous intervention on the part of God? Why do they neither go back again to Egypt, nor press forwards to Canaan? The more important these questions are, the more must we press for a satisfactory answer to be given to them. It is only our text that satisfies this demand. The simpler that the means are which Jehovah employs for the preservation of his people, —the more that we perceive that it is the simple productions of the wilderness, which the hand of God blesses, so that they are poured forth in abundance,—the more will the truth of this answer be apparent. What other reasons are there, on the contrary side, but the very same that have been brought forward against the miracle of

1 Allgem. Biblioth. i. p. 81. 2 Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. iii. p. 113.
3 See V. Bohlen, p. lxvii.

feeding the five thousand, and which admits also of the same refutation ?[1]

We have, however, still to remark on some particular objections against ch. xvi. (1.) That the name of the manna is incorrectly explained, xvi. 15; that מן as a pronoun is Chaldaic:—but does the derivation of it from the Arabic then come any nearer to the Hebrew than that from the Chaldee? The Hebrew מנה has, as is well known, a different signification, which is not admissible here. And why may not מן have belonged to the popular idiom, a supposition that agrees well with the circumstance of that form appearing in the Aramæan dialect? (2.) It is objected that in Num. xi. we have another narrative of the bestowment of the quails, that quite does away with this first one. But why should not the bestowment of them have occurred oftener than once? Why might not the people murmur again, and Moses express doubt? This, however, exactly agrees with their previous conduct; while Num. xi. 23 is evidence that Moses had already received similar proofs of the Divine Omnipotence. (3.) The position of this section here is assailed as unchronological, mention being made of the Sabbath, though not yet instituted, and of the ark of the covenant (xvi. 33, 34), which was first constructed at Sinai. But as relates to the Sabbath, it is just on this occasion that the law of it is given, being by no means presupposed (xvi. 22–30): a Divine command is immediately annexed to a Divine benefit, which introduces a speaking instance of the ingratitude and disobedience of the Israelites, who even at such moments transgressed the holy law; comp. ver. 28. This case is at the same time of importance, as showing the way and manner in which the law was delivered in general. Its development among the people is throughout historical; there is always a certain historical occasion, with which its statutes are connected. This is evidence of its historical truth. Had our author been one belonging to a later age, seeing that we certainly cannot charge him with any want of acquaintance with the solemn promulgation of the Law at Sinai; could he have prevailed with himself to transfer such an important and sacred fundamental law as that concerning the Sabbath to the position, in which we now find it? Could the fact of the bestowment of the manna belonging so far

[1] See Olshausen, Comment. i. p. 489, ff.

back to the past, have been viewed by him as possessed of such especial moment? Farther, the idea of the Sabbath is already in some measure contained in the law of the Passover, xii. 16, which thus prepares the way for the present command. Finally, the appointment permitting the preparation of food (xvi. 13, comp. George, ibid. p. 108), manifestly shows that the law is an early one, general as yet in its form, and intended afterwards to receive a more exact definition.—Verses 33 and 34 are certainly an addition, referring to a later period, which however need not surprise us in an author, who wished here to give some important connected notices concerning the manna at once, on the first occasion of its being bestowed. That this however is really our author's intention, is clear from verses 35, 36, which contain two remarks, concerning the manna's being eaten for forty years, and the definition of an Omer. Both these, however, may proceed from the same author, as well as the former; *i. e.* be of Mosaic origin. For this last definition will be found in perfect harmony with the many other definitions of measures and weights in the Pentateuch:[1] the author is accustomed to give definitions of that kind. But as relates to ver. 35, we may quote what has been already remarked by Carpzov (Introd. i. p. 83) in opposition to Spinoza, who believed that he had discovered in it a distinctive mark of its post-Mosaic composition: "Quo vero non potuerint prius et ab ipso Mose exarari, sub finem forte vitae suae, cum jam terrae Canaan proxime populus immineret, et ultimus oberrationis in deserto annus laberetur? Quid prohibet quominus prophetico, quo gaudebat, spiritu, Deoque ipsi revelante, ista praeviderit et in litteras retulerit? Cum enim Mosi et Aaroni patefactum divinitus esset, totis quadraginta annis per deserta erraturos Israelitas, antequam Canaanis adirent possessionem, Num. xiv. 33, quidni praesignificatum Mosi fuisse credatur, forte cum Manna depluere coepit, Israelitas annis totidem mirabili illo cibo alendos esse?"[2]

As to what relates besides to the miraculous bestowment of water from the rock, xvii. 1—7, the whole of our opponents' reasoning rests on the supposition of the identity of this narrative with

1 See Michaelis, Mos. Recht iv. p. 377, ff.

2 Besides, as affording a characteristic of the author, the comparison of the manna with coriander seed is worthy of remark: Ex. xvi. 31; Num. xi. 7. For the coriander is pre-eminently an Egyptian production; comp. Plin. H. N. xx. 82. Winer, Reall. i. p. 794, ff.

that in Num. xx. Though the place, the circumstances, and what followed are so different, it is decided that they must be but two different embellishments of the same fact, and then indeed the arbitrariness of the tradition becomes evident. But the less that criticism can sanction so arbitrary a proceeding, the more are we surprised at the following confession: "who must have imposed and perpetuated the name? The nation? would they have set up a memorial of their own shame?" (De Wette, p. 226.). Now this is perfectly true, inasmuch as there necessarily follows also from this, that what we here read is not a later invention. For would any one have invented a fiction so discreditable to his own nation, to their utter disgrace? Who then would have given credit to it, or approved of it? Thus we cannot understand the narrative, unless we have here before us real facts, transmitted to us from impartial hands.

The narrative of the conflict with the Amalekites receives full confirmation from the subsequent history both of the Pentateuch (comp. Num. xxiv. 20; Deut. xxv. 17, ff.), and also of later times (1 Sam. xv. 2, 3.). But it is said plainly to betray its mythical character by the representation of the answer given to prayer (De Wette, p. 227, ff.). Certainly the view of prayer that lies at the bottom of it is no rationalistic one; let it be proved, however, that this conception belongs only to a later period, and did not have its foundation of old, deep in the Hebrew faith. Gramberg at least finds the "superstition" of miraculous answers to prayer in all the books of the Old Testament (Krit. Gesch. d. Rel. Id. des A. T. vol. i.); so that this reason cannot hold good as a critical argument.

In ch. xviii. we find an institution, appointed by Moses at the suggestion of Jethro, relating to the civil constitution of the Israelites. The passage is important in several respects. In the first place, because it shows with what exactness information is furnished in the Pentateuch, since it distinguishes between divine and human institutions. We find the people, while in Egypt, subject to "elders," according to the analogy of all simple, and especially oriental, polities;[1] this established form had suffered a certain shock from Moses' coming forward and assuming his peculiar relation to the people. The people were referred to him and to the law he

[1] See Winer, Reallex. i. p. 58.

promulgated.—This relation of immediate dependence was however such as Moses himself must have sunk under. He therefore gives the people overseers of their own choice,—chiefs, according to a decimal system; by which he himself by no means surrenders his independent immediate relation to the people, while he yet renders the whole institution easier of management. It has been objected against this, that the matter is obscure, since the relation of heads over thousands, hundreds, &c., would lead to a subordination and judicial arrangements of a complicated character, and introduce an immense multitude of judges. But such an appointment is just the only one that can appear suitable under the circumstances then existing. With the promulgation of so many separate laws, where the business was to bring them home to the popular knowledge and feelings, so considerable a number of men was necessarily required. The supremacy of Moses' authority prevented anything complicated arising out of this: on the contrary the whole institution thus receives an exceedingly simple character. At the same time this result certainly follows, that it could be only provisional, since it bore reference, and could be applied, only to the circumstances of that time. Least of all could it be maintained in Canaan, when the people had fixed residences. A change therefore was necessary afterwards, and is to be seen in this, that Moses partly has regard in his laws to another form of government, and partly at the command of God himself adopts a new arrangement on another occasion (Num. xi.).

Even our opponents themselves recognize here an historical groundwork. It is however for the reason "that here for once everything proceeds naturally" (De Wette, p. 231.). But how so? Do not ver. 1 and 8 ff. precisely confirm all that had previously happened in Egypt, the wonders which the Lord had performed for Israel? Farther, do we not find Moses occupied with "laws and ordinances," which he delivers to the people, and for the application of which he takes care (ver. 13, 16, 17, 19), and are not these likewise called here חקי האלהים (ver. 16)? Hence we find what a confirmation this history affords of the earlier events, and of those that are subsequently related, and of the multitude of laws, &c.; what a view it gives us of the interior of the life of the people,

[1] See Vatke, Bibl. Th. i. p. 206.

and of Moses' personal agency, exhibiting to us the objective element, that series of Divine acts and ordinances, now reflected in its influence and results in the subjectivity [the character and proceedings] of the people and the lawgiver. Thus we now see that God's deeds and laws are no dead thing, but a living good deposited with the nation, such as cannot be imagined or explained apart from that objective basis.

But then indeed this narrative—since it is quite natural—must be at variance with the other "mythical" accounts: reference, it seems, is made in it to later appointments, such as the Tabernacle (ver. 12, 15, 19), and the giving of the law (De Wette, p. 232.). But where then is it that Jethro meets with Moses? According to ver. 5 at Sinai, and thus after they had left Rephidim. The document affords no more precise information as to the time of their meeting. All that we can plainly discover from it is, that the date of the event is here anticipated, and certainly for good reasons that are easily explained, since it did not belong to the subsequent history of the legislation. Why then should not whatever was requisite be presupposed? No one, however, would say that the whole of the Sinai legislation is here alluded to as already in existence.

§ 24. CONTINUATION. THE GIVING OF THE LAW AT SINAI. GENERAL REMARKS.

To subject the Mosaic institutions and laws to a closer examination as to their systematic connection, as well as to their historical promulgation, is what we now propose to do. The more unsafe and perilous that the ground here is for the exercise of criticism,[1] the more comprehensive and decisive are the results obtained; they have the greatest influence on the treatment of the whole subsequent Jewish history: they concern the basis and main pillar of the Theocratic system.

The question to be answered is this: what was effected by Moses and his period, and what mode of thinking, what course of life and action, should we attribute to them? Either that which is presented to us in the Pentateuch, or another, perhaps of an opposite

1 [The author must refer to *Neological* criticism only, which assumes to itself that name *par excellence*.—TR.]

kind. The earlier school of criticism, however willing to deny Moses any share in the Mosaic law, even in the Decalogue, and to regard it as a development of later times, yet completely overlooked the positive side of the question, and was satisfied with the negative endeavour to divest the Pentateuch as much as possible of Mosaic elements. The latest critical investigation has treated this subject with greater consistency, and to Vatke[1] especially belongs the merit of having united the negative critical side with its positive detail, showing what we ought to imagine to ourselves, on that supposition, as the true picture of the Mosaic period. The ideas, expressed by De Wette for instance in this respect, were so indefinite and vague, as to display no sort of internal unity and connection. But on the other hand a more consistent carrying out of the critical enquiry has led to the conclusion, that, supposing the Israelites were not such a nation as they are described in the Pentateuch to have been, they must have passed through an entirely different course of development, to reach that condition, which we see transferred by priestly feeling to the earliest times of their existence: that they must then have been like all their neighbour nations in anterior Asia, and rising out of this condition, not until a later period, by impulses they received, and mental contact with others in many ways, have become what we afterwards perceive them to have been. The nation was devoted to the worship of nature, and particularly to that star-worship which was spread, through the whole of anterior Asia and Egypt; and honoured Saturn especially as their supreme deity. Moses confirmed amongst them a regard for the more ancient national God, endeavoured to banish the worship of other gods, spiritualized the natural elements of their conceptions and worship, and laid the foundation of a purer moral life. At that time, however, they were as yet unfitted for a political constitution, and the religious ideas also, that we meet with in after times, were only in the bud. The result of the labours of Moses was not a finished whole, but only the commencement and starting-point of a higher development: the elements of the popular mind were not yet harmonized, not even in the conceptions of Moses himself; their conflict therefore required to continue, and it was only by degrees that their conceptions, worship, and moral life

[1] Bibl. Theol. i., p. 184—251.

could perfectly bring out their ideal principle. This is the result to which Vatke has come, with regard to the amount of verified historical facts belonging to this period.

What we question first, is the fundamental supposition involved in this view. It lies at the bottom of a multitude of recent critical investigations, only less decidedly insisted on and carried out, and affects the relation of the Old Testament theocratic principle in general to all those tendencies and forms of life which are not Old Testament in their character. For the whole Mosaic institution with all its enactments might be the system of the later age, falsely transferred to earlier times, and still the question to be put would always remain the same. Can this theocratic principle be deduced from the elements of that worship of nature which is regarded as prevailing earlier, and as deeply rooted in the popular mind? Is this nothing more than an idealization and development of the former? The belief in the personal and living God, and the belief in the powers of nature,—the theocratic worship, and the most refined form of the worship of nature,—stand in a relation of distinction from and opposition to one another, that is by no means comparative, but specific. If we conceive of all the elements of natural religion in their mutual contact with one another, the process of development thence arising will always be followed by a result specifically distinct from the theocratic principle; and history shows that the formation of mythologies is a process of mutual commixture and reciprocal impulse, excited by the collision of many various elements, but the product here has always been of an essentially different character. The peculiarity and originality of the Israelitish faith and life have remained in the midst of all these movements; yea the greater that the mental impulse from without has been, the more firm and consolidated has been the form, even to one of external ossification, that the Old Testament principle has assumed. The nature of the spirit that is here at work, is quite different from that which is supposed in the other case: it is not one that raises developments out of itself, but a definite and completed form, so peculiar, that what is contained in it does not appear as a something produced, but as the appropriation of a given objective thing. Were we now at liberty even to limit this originality of the Old Testament principle to this, that we only "concede to the Hebrews the merit of having acknowledged and ho-

noured the supreme God as the only God, to the exclusion of all inferior deities, and all mythology,"[1] this at once involves us in an admission which we cannot explain as a mere process of development from a preceding natural religion. For how has it happened that this natural religion has been brought to that point nowhere else?

But it is clear that that definition of the Old Testament principle is a mere negation. This, however, supposes something positive, prompting the negation, which is not defined, but which is all that is of consequence. How this impulse was given to overcome that opposition, is stated only in the most indefinite manner. "The production [genesis] of what is "great and peculiar" in the Old Testament principle is certainly thus described: "the awakening of the monotheistic belief is an absolute act, supposes a prophetic state of mind, and can be rightly comprehended only as a Revelation" (p. 707.). But what we are to understand by this we learn afterwards, where it is said: "an Upper-Asiatic principle was cast on the agitated soil of Canaan, torn asunder by opposite principles; it prepared the way here by the conflict which it excited for the revelation of the pure Idealism, which the later Parsee faith did not reach; gained the victory over Realism through its identity with the devouring spirit of the Canaanitish natural religion, unfolded itself then in a milder formation, and gradually enriched itself with the glorified forms of nature's aspect,[2] by which it was brought nearer to the general apprehension and feeling, and at the same time made an advance to a more concrete perfection" (p. 709.). With this author the Revelation is no other than the spirit, which, in its conflict with different opposite systems, penetrates and overcomes them; but from what quarter it derived strength to penetrate them, and ability to overcome them, we are not told. This is also only a modification of the older view, according to which the adoration of Jehovah was developed from a previously prevalent Polytheism, a view rejected by this author (p. 705); without, however, our being advanced a single step farther, or learning the mode of that development. Everything which Vatke regards as preparation and progress belongs to the sphere of generalities, with which the particu-

[1] So Vatke, l. c. p. 700.

[2] [Perhaps rather, *the contemplation of nature*: but the passage is far from clear. —TR.]

larity of the Hebrew faith has no coincidence; but rather by this subjective particularity the particularity of these preparations and proceedings is made evident, which fall therefore under an entirely new department of spiritual action, and appear in their subjective character not as an inward striving and longing, but as the possession of a given thing objectively presented.

It is only the supposition of a Divine training of a real and historical kind, by which the Hebrew nation was guided in a wholly peculiar manner to their exalted destiny of being the people of God, that explains the relation in which the religion of the Old Testament stands to all the religions that are independent of it. It was not the nation that made itself what it was, but it was elevated and educated so as to become that;—this is the necessary supposition without which it is impossible to comprehend the principle and life of the Theocracy. This supposition is as much sustained by the internal nature and peculiar worth of the Old Testament religion, as it is indicated by the historical development of the nation; so that we must place ourselves in twofold opposition, both to that peculiarity,—since the dogmatic and ethical contents of the Old Testament will have their depth and importance misunderstood in a manner that runs counter to all true exposition,—and also to all history, if we explain this history as a fable. As we are obliged then to reject our opponents' hypothesis as to the former point, because it regards the peculiar distinction of the Old Testament religion as being only the product of opposite systems and the victory over them, but leaves its positive element out of sight; we must now enter more minutely into the historical reasons given in support of that hypothesis.

Here, then, with regard to the Mosaic period, we are in the first place given to know, that at the outset the traditions concerning the religion of the Patriarchs are to be set aside, for no positive historical elements can be drawn from the narratives in Genesis (p. 184.). Thus then we are bereft violently enough of the historical foreground, and arbitrary decision may now carry on its rash game with less impediment. The first step is now taken to raise up another foundation in the place of that which has been thoughtlessly rejected, such as shall approve itself to be historical. We, on the contrary, on our side can regard the agency of Moses only as founded on a more ancient covenant of Jehovah with the ancestors of Israel; and

the whole mode of the Legislation becomes obscure, if not founded on such an antecedent; for the Legislation is most intimately connected with the fact of the departure from Egypt; and that again is so much connected with the patriarchal life, that we here meet everywhere with the earlier and the later standing in the closest causal conjunction. Great weight, however, is laid on the unanimous testimony of tradition, that, in the Mosaic period, the nation was devoted to idolatry. Here again the most arbitrary treatment of history meets us everywhere. The mode of the representation given in the Pentateuch is said to be governed by priestly influence; hence the description there presented of the idolatrous practices of the people is not the pure truth: the character of truth belongs more to the expressions of the prophets, such as Amos v. 25, 26. But as this prophet, in the passage quoted, immediately speaks of the forty years' wandering in the desert, we cannot on those principles see there either any true historical information,[1] and thus we are again thrown into the abyss of uncertainty. That the statement in question, however, is any contradiction of the Pentateuch is not to be supposed, for this reason, that Amos everywhere proceeds on the supposition of the Pentateuch being known and admitted; and the less so, as the Pentateuch also speaks of Canaanitish idolatry as already existing among the people (Num. xxv.), and the prophet intends to point out the identity of the character of his own age with that of the Mosaic, in reference to the practices of the idolaters, and therefore he attributes the form of the idolatry of his own time to the Mosaic. Ezekiel's statements (xx. 7, 8, xxiii. 3, 8) are however in as exact accordance with those of the Pentateuch, and the positive efforts in opposition to the worship of idols are described with express reference to the accounts of the Pentateuch. We are far from denying the constant inclination of the people to idolatry; but we ask whether their long residence in Egypt does not supply historically a sufficient ground of explanation for that, even though the purer light of the patriarchal faith was not unknown to them? The narratives of the Pentateuch allude to Egyptian, and afterwards to Canaanitish, idolatry. This plainly shows how little any definite form of heathen idolatry and worship had become the property of the

[1] As Gramberg says: "The prophet's statement cannot be called purely historical, as he joins with it the tradition of the forty years' journey through the wilderness." Gesch. d. Relig. Id. i. p. 473.

nation; it adopts every form that is presented to it; it is subject to external influences. Hence it is clear, that in spite of all their natural inclination to idolatry, a higher element always prevailed among the people, which did not permit that tendency to be the exclusive one, and to maintain its ground alone. That tendency, however could not be combated by idealization,—the victory of the opposite system, which was founded in the nature of the case, was not of that kind,—but by the opposite principle itself, and the decided impressive exhibition of it. It has always been thus in the kingdom of God, which rejects all syncretism, as running counter to its essential nature, and leaves it to heathenism. Or how would it have been possible for the prophets, supposing they found in existence only that syncretistic worship of Jehovah,[1] which the theology of Vatke represents it to have been, to have directed their polemical assaults on the people and their idolatry, on the ground of the ancient covenant relation? Nothing in fact could then be more foolish than such polemics, which may also be assailed, as being of too early a date, with the same weapons that have been employed against what are indeed the more practical polemics of Moses. The conduct and proceedings of the prophets can be explained only as they are sustained by a previous transaction, serving as a foundation—only as presupposing a covenant, that has been shamefully violated by the nation. However rude and uncontrolled we may conceive the idolatry in the wilderness to have been, it certainly was not so to a greater degree than in the times of the revolted and godless kingdom of Israel; and the ministry of the prophets, on the principle that a revelation is to be admitted according to the measure of men's capacity to receive it, or according to the entire moral standing of an age (p. 230), is just as inexplicable as that of Moses: we should then act most advisedly to bring theirs into question also.

It is now indeed also said (p. 226) that the agency of the prophets is to be conceived of as in the closest connection with that (professedly) of Moses: "the idea of legislation by the prophets precedes, from the nature of the case, the external objective form,

1 Comp. *e. g.*, p. 250: "Moses introduced the worship of his Jehovah, the conception of whom was certainly quite different from the Jehovah of the mass of the people, not as something quite different and new; and hence he did not oppose the worship of nature in the same way as the later prophets, but proceeding from what already existed, he sought to transform and enlighten from within the entire mind of the nation."

especially since that appears as a well-digested system." But does this give us any sort of explanation of the polemics of the prophets? Granting even that the prophets appear as lawgivers—which Vatke by no means proves—how could they appear in this character before a nation, which was as yet unacquainted with any fixed rule [Norm], that asserted a jurisdiction over it, and according to which also the prophets administered decisions and rebukes? We must then adopt the supposition of such facts as contain far more positive substance in them, than the mere idealization of a rude idolatrous worship and life.

Let us proceed, however, more closely to particulars. Moses, it is said, gave the nation no new *political constitution as a state*: the Pentateuch itself does not entitle him to that distinction; but we must rather regard the older tribal-constitution, which, however, can make no claim to that name, as still continuing, and the different tribes as united, as they were subsequently in the period of the Judges, only by the personal authority of an individual (p. 204, ff.). This circumstance, rightly apprehended, might have conducted the author to the true understanding of the case. Was it really the object of the Torah, to found an outward political constitution? How often, in the history of the people, has that been changed, and yet the Torah has always remained the same! The latter part of the history, after the captivity, is here the more instructive to us, as the principle of stability in reference to the γράμμα of the Law was then most predominant. But while the Law is far removed from making any such attempt to establish as a fixed thing a mere political form of the state, there prevails in it, on the other hand, the higher view of being suited to all forms of polity, and of conforming and bringing them into harmony with itself, supposing they were not in direct positive opposition to it. Hence it follows then,—as the Law constantly keeps in view the internal department of the religious life, and seeks to penetrate, sanctify, and transform all that is outward only from this highest standing-point,—that that also, which Moses found already in existence, whether we call it a tribe-constitution or a state-constitution, had no such direct opposition to the Law. We cannot obtain a satisfactory explanation of this circumstance, however, unless by supposing the Mosaic age to have been preceded by such a system of life as fitted men for the promulgation of the Law.

Such a Law could never have been given in the midst of a state of society, which was heathen both as to its political form and the character of the people, being pervaded by that anti-theocratic principle; for its necessary conditions would have been wanting. Thus we are again referred to the primitive history of the Hebrew people as the only ground of explanation that can here help us through: we may conceive of the beneficial influences of the patriarchal age on the Mosaic, as being even to a great extent weakened and lessened, yet absolutely to deny their existence, considering the nature of that primitive age, were impossible. But what does the whole argument in general amount to, when the influence of personal authority is admitted? If Moses was, what according to our records he must have been, that which is called an organic state-constitution could have no application to the case of the Hebrews. From the Lawgiver's occupying such a position, and having that particular relation to Jehovah;[1] from the immediate connection of the Deity with the people, so that we find the latter everywhere under direct divine guidance and guardianship; the Hebrew constitution acquires the entire peculiarity that renders the name of Theocracy befitting it, in the proper meaning of the term. The author quoted treats all this indeed as a mere abstraction, a general view, which was first deduced from relations actually existing (p. 211, comp. p. 541.). This mere postulate of the non-reality of that relation, is also the proper ground of the whole of our opponent's reasoning. The constitution which the Pentateuch exhibits is no constitution, for what it proposes as the supreme principle of it, never existed in that manner, at least in the time of Moses. The circle of proof is clear enough: going on such a supposition indeed, the whole history must have its form completely altered; but happily this inversion of things falls to the ground along with the supposition.

The arguments against the Mosaic Law that have been already adduced, follow next. The Mosaic polity is founded on the sup-

[1] "Moses was as little a priest as he was a king; and from his time all these men of desire, as they are called from the first circumstance that forms the foundation of their character, or men of the desert also, because being themselves prepared in the seclusion and loneliness of the desert, they were to command and conduct the people also through the desert again in one sense or another, were the only men and leaders who were appointed by God, without any other title or insignia than the staff, which they had brought with them as pilgrims out of the wilderness, and only by immediate divine power did they govern and lead the people." Fr. von Schlegel, Philos. d. Gesch. i. p. 224.

position of the existence of agriculture and a settled mode of life: such a law therefore could not have originated with Moses, who knew nothing of the natural condition of Canaan, who could not foresee the issue of the invasion, and who could not in his legislation presuppose the existence of such relations, as are formed gradually and spontaneously (?), and have never been general (p. 212, ff.). It must be already plain from what goes before, that the way in which our opponents view things, not only sets aside altogether the particular government and agency of God in his kingdom, but also that, with regard to the more human and general relations of society, it by no means keeps up the distinction, required by the truth of history, between the different and entirely separate modes of apprehension and development peculiar to the East and the West respectively, but confounds them throughout. It must be plain, how little adapted such a way of viewing things, as that now before us, would be to explain *e.g.* the relation of Mohammed and the Koran with its abrupt legislation to the prevailing state of society. It involves a complete overlooking of the fact that, among the Orientals, law arises in quite another way than among the Greeks. History affords sufficient proof that, in the Eastern world, law, in its original appearance, assumes a more abstract form, and a rigorous, because purely divine and immediate character; and the less that it recognizes in law a human production, as the Grecian world does,[1] but sees in the creative and constructive power of law its divine element, the less can we admit the supposition of such a principle, as that of a custom gradually arising and being elevated into a law. Besides, in this assertion, everything depends on the question: Did the Israelites, and Moses in particular, propose Canaan as the firm immoveable goal of all their endeavours and undertakings, or not? We make the whole history of the Hebrews a mere game of chance and blind accident, if we dispute the fact of the lawgiver's being well aware of that ultimate aim. But if that is firmly established, it is plain how little reason there is to deny the Mosaic origin of a law, on account of its referring to the sure possession of the land of Canaan, as well-considered enquiry has at all times admitted.[2] The disobedient and obstinate

1 Leo has spoken well on this point, Universal-Gesch. i. p. 162, ff.

2 Comp. Eichhorn, Einl. 3, p. 263. Bleek, in Rosenmüller's Repertorium i. p. 13. Winer, Reallex. i. p. 494.

spirit of the people must have induced the more exact regulation of these future circumstances, rather than the abstaining from doing so. And was there then for the Israelites no point of connection in existence at all, so as to justify the assertion that an agricultural life was at that time an entirely foreign element to the people, and opposed to their habits? Is the transition in general from the nomadic to the agricultural mode of life so difficult, and not rather one that follows of itself, as soon as a firm possession of land is secured? Must not their residence in Egypt have made the people already familiar with the thought of it, and accustomed them to this kind of life?[1] And do we not find, so early as the patriarchal age, the disposition towards it (Winer, Reallex. i. p. 22), so that the ground must be regarded as being at any rate levelled and prepared in many respects for the Mosaic legislation? This argument however is encountered with annihilating force by the fact, that a considerable number of ordinances in the law relate primarily to the circumstances and mode of life in the desert (see on this subseq.); whence we may conclude with certainty both the mediating transition-character of the Mosaic constitution, as between the Egyptian and the Canaanitish mode of life, and also the new sphere of social existence into which the people were transported by their abode in the wilderness. Had the tendency of the people even really preponderated at an earlier time towards nomadic life, this must now have been abated to indifference by the new sphere into which they were cast; so that the new generation that had grown up and been educated in it, accustomed to the gifts of the Lord in a waste and barren land, must now have looked with longing desire for the completion of those gifts by the possession of Canaan, and must also have complied with the divine will in the occupation of that country with a more willing and accommodated spirit.

We have then the argument drawn from the nature of the worship and the ritual law taken up again by Vatke also, and made still stronger. The history of the worship is said to compel us here to the supposition "that Moses founded no combined system of worship, and consecrated no proper tribe of priests for the perform-

1 "On ne doit pas s'en étonner: ils sortaient de l' Egypte, où l' arpentage, comme le dit Mr Girard (desc. de l' Eg. i. p. 326) était une des principales fonctions des prêtres. Parmi les livres hermétiques il y en avait deux consacrés à la description détaillée de ce royaume et du cours du Nil, c' était à proprement parler, une espace de cadastré, dont les prêtres étaient dépositaires. Salvador, Hist. des instit. de Moise i. p. 242.

ance of it" (p. 218.). The argument taken in this form will receive due attention afterwards; yet even here the facts and difficulties opposed to that opinion appear to have presented themselves directly to the author; for he seeks to have this result regarded as brought "to complete certainty," simply by the examination of that portion of the legislation which belongs to this place.

"The ritual law (says Vatke) embraces a multitude of forms, accidental in themselves, which might at first grow up gradually, and then subsequently have been combined into a system. The combination of these usages is only a product of long mental development: the stiff mechanism of the form is never the immediate phenomenon, and on account of its finality must also not be regarded as divine revelation. To what purpose are statutes and symbols, if the consciousness of sin is not powerfully awakened, and the higher significance of the symbols at the same time disclosed?" The ritual part of the Pentateuch is so conjoined with the moral and judicial portion, that the one is always found placed beside the other, and the one casts light on the other, inasmuch as it shows, that in the ritual and juridical element also there dwells a profound ethical meaning, a relation that appears even in the Decalogue in its original form; without this entire theocratic symbolism, however, having the meaning which it contains developed. In this respect the Psalms present the strongest contrast to the Pentateuch, for in them we observe the subjective effect of that symbolism in all its fulness and excellency. On the other hand, while the Pentateuch sets out from the fundamental thought, that Israel is a holy nation of priests, it comprehends under this a purely objective exhibition to the people of the ethical as well as of the ritual and juridical elements. Thus the whole law is essentially *Act:* the ethical element, so soon as it comes forward, appears immediately incorporated again, by a symbolical representation. It is, however, this actual form that necessarily is the thing which immediately comes before us, and it is through this that all else, which is derived and secondary, can have existence: it was the objective representation of divine righteousness and love in the Law that could first excite and communicate subjective love and righteousness, but not *vice versâ*. It is the same in the case of our Saviour's work: he dies, without his disciples knowing and receiving the impression of the meaning of his death, the practical completion of divine righteousness and love:

our Lord's expressions on the subject are almost forgotten by the disciples—and yet this act must first be set forth in all its objective significance, in order that it may inspire the church with faith and life. So it is also with the Law: it must be delivered, that its internal worth may be known, felt, and experienced, and delivered indeed in its immediate objective form; for only thus could it bear the fruits, which it was intended to yield and has yielded.—But now to the ritual and symbolical part of the Law, the more peculiar and unique that its subjective effects are, belongs the peculiarity of its excluding all reflection, and allowing its voice to be heard only in what is practical. It has justly been remarked[1] that in this Mosaism is the precise contrast to Prophetism, the latter being the establishment of the ritual element in the inner man, and the subordination of the external symbol to the internal signification. Now, as it may be shown that the efforts of the prophets must have been directed as much to the observance of the ritual Law, as they certainly were mainly directed to the internal relation of the life to Jehovah, which the mode of worship was merely the means to bring about, we are thus referred by the Pentateuch itself to a time when the external objective act is still treated as harmonizing with that which is internal and subjective; and it is very well said by Bauer, that this absence of reflection throws the Pentateuch back beyond the period of prophecy into a higher antiquity.—But, even supposing that the Law had arisen as the result of a spiritual excitement of mind and of reflection, so as to be a dead and externally ossified prophecy, how could it have assumed the appearance that it has at present? Every thing like a systematic form is here entirely neglected: the development of the Law in historical facts is that which alone prevails; this linking of individual particulars to a great whole is what alone furnishes a sufficient explanation of the contradictions that occur in particular details, and the subsequent abrogation or closer definition of earlier portions. Our opponents' hypothesis, on the other hand, necessarily demands that the whole should have a systematic construction: the spirit of stiff abstraction which fashioned and gave its complete form to such a law, setting

1 Comp. the essay by Bauer, containing much that is excellent, on the Mosaic origin of the legislation of the Pentateuch, in his Journal of Speculative Theology, i. p. 140, ff. That fundamental thought is also involved in the theory of an oral tradition of the Law, given along with the Law at Sinai, which we find in Jewish theology.

it forth with abstract consistency, might certainly employ the history as far as to represent the external form of its introduction; but it would then be obliged to confine itself to remarking simply the fact of the Mosaic origin, treating the manner (the how?) of that origin as an entirely foreign question, for the solution of which it is impossible to imagine any influence that can have led to it; while the historical development of the Law would then be farthest of all from the point.

"The many casuistical and positive external, *i. e.*, accidental appointments of the ritual Law, most plainly betray its later age: they are dependent on accidental circumstances, and arise only out of prolonged experience and continued reflection; while the different parts that compose the Pentateuch themselves suppose a difference of religious sentiments, requiring several centuries for its completion." (Vatke, p. 219.). Now, this separation of the casuistical from the general legal appointments is arbitrary. They have rather both that necessary internal connection, that what is general cannot be brought into operation without a special appointment; the special appointments are the necessary consequences of the general ones; the latter would have had no significance, force, or effect at all, but must have remained mere abstract propositions, had they not immediately received a concrete application to society and individual cases. In this way the Law has maintained a concrete character, opposed to all later abstractness, an indication that directly points us to an ancient origin, not to later labours, the result of reflection.[1] If the Law was to have force, it required to have as the constant object of its actual contemplation the life of the people in its concrete exhibition; and it is an evidence of the true wisdom of the lawgiver, that he does not treat *e. g.* the Decalogue as a mere abstract generality, but as such enactments as must at once be consistently carried out in practical application. The same is the case with the Sermon on the Mount: but there, on the contrary, even on the principles of our opponents, the speciality of the decisions admits of vindication; yet here also, even as there, the

1 "Falsa est sententia, leges origine tenus apud *omnes* populos *generales* fuisse, genioque antiquitatis contraria. Ex singularibus orta sunt generalia; en historiam priscæ legislationis! Nullo non tempore ea quæ non accurate definita sed abstracta tantum erant, odit prisca ætas, improbavit Oriens." Herbst, "Obss. de Pent. IV. librorum poster. auctore et editore," in the Comment. Theoll. ed. Rosenmüller, etc. i. p. 15.

same truly divine idea predominates, that there is no commandment of God that must not, as an evidence of his holiness, at once become the property of man in its entire truth and fulness, its life and internal advantage.

Finally, as to the remark that most of the laws relating to the ritual and the priesthood have the interests of the priests more in view than those of the people, and thus betray their partial origin, it rests on the one-sided hypothesis of the later organization of the priesthood in general (Vatke, p. 221, ff.), which indeed destroys the idea of the relation of the priesthood to the people at large, an idea that represents every thing connected with the former as promoting the interests of the latter also. This, however, involves a contradiction, that can be solved only by an admission in favour of the Mosaic origin of the Law. The interest of the priesthood must be regarded here as being as much an element as an object of the constitution. Such a condition is possible only where the priesthood itself comes before the people as a new thing, and derives from its entire position the title to assume such privileges. We search in vain for such a state of things in the whole of the post-Mosaic period: by the rise of the royal power that of the priests was still more confined, being directed to what already existed and was fixed by appointment, so that it could maintain itself, and, so to speak, prolong its existence, only by keeping close to that. On the contrary, in the Mosaic age, the position of the priestly order is quite different. Moses and Aaron themselves belong to it; by the former, it is established in its new privileges. However little we know concerning the primitive origin of the priestly races among other nations, their whole position evidences a period that laid a firm foundation of that superiority, that spiritual as well as political preponderance. In the present case the manner in which it was founded is manifest, and certainly cannot be explained in any other way than by the consideration of the whole of Moses' ministry, and all that he was to the people, and not simply by the mere personal distinction of the lawgiver. The fact that the tribe of Levi, to which Moses belonged, was the bearer of the Law in its external realization, is explicable only on the admission of its Mosaic origin: every other view must change the history here into a mere game of chance.

Thus all these objections only lead us to seek in the age of Moses for a legal code, which must certainly be verified also in all its par-

ticulars as necessarily belonging to that period. How this code now, on the one hand, shows its genuine historical character, as being one arising out of that age and suited to its circumstances; and, on the other hand, shows itself as truly prophetical also, having regard by actual contemplation to the future history of the people; is the investigation which we now propose to follow out.

§ 25. CONTINUATION. EXODUS XX.—XL.

The Decalogue stands at the head of the collective body of laws. The conclusion of modern criticism in reference to it is, that, in the form at least in which we have it, it does not proceed from Moses, but, as shewn by the comparison of Ex. xx. and Deut. v., has been derived from a simpler portion preserved by tradition, and paraphrastically enlarged.[1] We here pass over such reasons as have no meaning at all in a critical inquiry, such as that the Decalogue could not be written on two tables (comp. on the other hand Ex. xxxii. 15), and shall pay regard to only two principal objections.

There is no sort of evidence, it is said, of the famed simplicity of the Decalogue, such as we should expect to find in such legislative outlines; but, on the contrary, there prevails in it a regard to the disposition of the mind—a command that all worship should be without images, while such worship had at that time no existence —a conception nearly approaching to the Rabbinical idea of the sacredness of the divine name, &c. This argument is certainly good against those who adhere to the merely apologetic point of view of the simplicity of these ordinances, and sufficiently exposes the bareness of that. For that simplicity should evidently receive a more exact definition in accordance with the contents of those commandments. Their brevity is the mere formal circumstance; but their meaning shows that here in a few touches we have an uncommonly rich principle for the formation of new laws. If we sever the Decalogue from those appointments which are called into existence by it, then we certainly have reason to be surprised, as we cannot see how a people, possessing in these commands such a mine of profound ethics, did not advance farther. But if we con-

[1] Comp. Fulda, in the Neues Repertor., 3, p. 204, ff. De Wette, Beitr. p. 253, ff. Einl. 191. George, p. 79. Von Bohlen, clxxiii. Vatke, p. 203, ff. 239.

ceive it in its productive intention and conjunction with the rest of the Law, then the one here sustains the other. The Law supposes a higher ethical conviction, the basis of which appears in the Decalogue.

Simplicity and brevity have thus been incorrectly confounded. As some of the commandments are longer than others, the idea hence arose of later additions or revisions, and the deviations of Deuteronomy from Exodus appeared also to favour this notion. The so-called paraphrastic additions, however, are, for the greater part, historical reasons for the commandment, references to the history of creation, the departure from Egypt, the abode there, and the future possession of Canaan. What do these prove? They cannot be called enlargements of the Law, for they are rather an introduction to it. Neither can they be of later origin; because, for one thing, they refer to the historical condition of the people at that time, and, again, if we suppose as their date such a period as one at which the referring of the command to Moses would give it sufficient authority, an additional reason would then be superfluous. But those additions rather show us the living mode, directly opposed to every thing mechanical, of the introduction of those fundamental principles of the Theocracy. This has its root not in a dead abstraction, but in the full and powerful consciousness of a living God, who testifies his presence by acts of salvation. None but such a fundamental thought could have produced the other commandments, and the more we keep in view this productive fulness of the first command, the more shall we cease to see in those that follow, only abrupt and insulated thoughts. But from him who brought such fundamental principles to bear on the life of the people, we are also fully warranted in expecting a farther perfecting and carrying out of what was thus laid down.

The book of Deuteronomy unquestionably refers to the first promulgation of the Decalogue in ch. v. 12, 15, 16. The author, though acquainted with that legal form, indulges in a certain freedom, as he makes reference, especially once, to the circumstances on which the Israelites were now entering.[1] How should we explain this freedom, if we were to adopt the opinion of the later origin of the present form of the Decalogue? Would a later author have per-

[1] Observe the addition שָׂדֵהוּ in v. 21.

mitted himself such an alteration of what he himself in the most decided manner attributes to Moses, and with the sacredness and inviolability of which he is deeply impressed, and not rather have observed the most conscientious exactness in the repetition of the Mosaic form? Nothing is gained by the supposition of an original traditional formula of a simpler kind; for as soon as that had been once consigned to writing—in which case, that it should already have received a paraphrastic enlargement is hardly imaginable—that form must then have been preserved. Thus the very construction of the Decalogue, considered both in itself and in its twofold form, necessarily leads us to the belief of its Mosaic origin.

The following laws as far as ch. xxiii. are closely connected with the Decalogue (§ 6), and this very connection assures their equal antiquity. Respecting these, however, it is of particular importance, that they refer for the most part to ancient usage, so that their immediate promulgation appears evident, when considered in reference to the fundamental principles of the Theocracy, as well as the state of society then existing. Thus there is a reference to earlier customs in the ordinances, xx. 21, ff. (comp. Winer, Reallex. i., p. 57); xxi. 1, ff. (comp. Gen. xxix.); xxi. 7 (only a temporary law and subsequently abrogated, Deut. xv. 17, which indicates a gradual modification of old customs—see Michaelis, Mos. R. ii., p. 371); xxi. 13 (comp. Gen. x. 14, xxvii. 45); xxi. 20 (where the indefinite expression ינקם can be well explained only by the supposition of a custom); xxi. 24 (see Rosenm. Schol. ad h. l.). From these examples we may draw a conclusion for the others, where the usage is obscure and unknown to us; but the promulgation of such laws at this time must be recognized by every one as not accidental and arbitrary. Farther, we find also an exact regard paid to the circumstances of the time themselves, and some things referable only to them: thus the erection of merely provisional altars, xx. 21, ff., to which xxi. 14 also refers; thus the expression xxi. 13, "I will appoint thee the place to which he shall flee" (comp. Num. xxxv. 6); thus xx. 28, "thou shalt give unto me the first-born of thy sons," supposes the appointment of the Passover, but contains nothing more than that fundamental thought; thus also the impressive reference to the abode in Egypt, xxii. 20, xxiii. 9; thus the brief, though here quite necessary, statement concerning the feasts, which contains only a general

sketch of them, a general indication of the duty of the people in this respect, xxiii. 20, ff., &c. De Wette[1] confines himself to stating some passages in these laws, which have regard to circumstances belonging to Palestine—the possession of fields,—which, according to what was observed, § 24, proves nothing. That בית יהוה xxiii. 19 should be employed concerning the Tabernacle also, and that the lawgiver should already refer to its erection, need not surprise any one: for it only shows the intimate connection of the entire legislation. The more general question, which De Wette puts (p. 258) in reference to all the laws given at Sinai after the Decalogue, is a strange one,—why these also were not placed by Moses on the tables of stone? The reason of the graving of the Decalogue on tables of stone, arose from its being intended to serve as a brief compendium and statement of the chief contents of the Law, and to be distinguished also symbolically by its form, as by the mode of its preservation, as a fixed inviolable holy Law; so that by the constant reference to those fundamental appointments the people were referred to the summary of the Law, and taught to comprehend it in its simplicity, while at the same time they received an impression of the importance and worth of the whole Law by these its fundamental appointments.

We pass on to the objections that are brought against the Mosaic origin of the *Tabernacle*. An appeal is made,[2] 1. to the mythical form in which its origin is introduced to us, especially in its being said that Jehovah himself showed Moses the model of it (xxv. 9, 40), and endowed the workmen with special divine wisdom and skill, &c. The description certainly represents Moses to us as a prophet in the proper sense of the term; he beholds (internally) the sacred tent in prophetic vision. If we should employ this circumstance as a critical argument against the Mosaic origin, in doing so we question neither more nor less than the whole of Moses' prophetic relation to the Deity. We have here an analogy that is quite decisive in a critical respect. The prophet Ezekiel likewise beheld in "the visions of God" the temple which he describes (xl. 1, ff.); but who in our day would think of denying him the authorship of that sec-

1 Beitr. p. 256, ff. Vater iii., p. 657. Comp. Vatke, p. 428, ff. ("The treatise Exod. xxi.—xxiii. 19, unquestionably contains the oldest laws of the Pentateuch.")

2 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. p. 259, ff. Hartmann. Hebräerin am Putztisch, ii. pp. 8, ff. iii. p. 163, ff. Von Bohlen, p. cxii., ff.

tion on that account? 2. Particular stress is laid on the contrast which the condition of the Israelitish nation at that time presents to the splendour and speedy completion of the tent. In this one proceeds on equally incorrect conceptions concerning the nature of the sacred tent, as concerning the condition of the people at the time. That tent was certainly splendid, but, in point of fact, exceedingly simple in its construction. If we compare it with the monuments of Egyptian architecture, which the Hebrews certainly could not be unacquainted with, since they were themselves employed in the erection of them, its relative simplicity must strike us in a much greater degree. As to the materials that were required for it, it admits of proof that the Israelites might very well be in possession of them at that time. The wilderness even might supply them with many of these things, such as the skins of animals, especially those of the תחש, a sort of sea-dog, which abounds in the Arabian gulf, and whose skin is particularly well suited for the purpose mentioned.[1] The most important material, the wood for the tent, is just that which is found here most plentifully, while Palestine is deficient in acacia trees.[2] With respect to other things, the metals, precious stones, purple, and spices, we must keep in view the condition of a people that had just come out of Egypt. History describes that country as having mercantile connections with Asia even from the earliest times, and we have to regard Egypt, especially Arabia and Phœnicia, as the states that took most part in this traffic.[3] The Phœnicians commenced their trade by the exportation of Assyrian and Egyptian wares; they took an active part in the primitive caravan-trade of eastern Africa, as well as the nations of that part of the world itself.[4] Let it not however be objected, that a nation which was quite nomadic like the Hebrews, must have remained unaffected by that traffic. It was just such nations that in ancient times took an essential part in mercantile affairs: those Arabian tribes of the desert that were quite nomadic carried on the Tyrian and Phœnician land traffic most eagerly, and this connection

1 V. Eichhorn, Einl. 3, p. 266, ff. Gesenius, Hand-WB., sub voce תחש.

2 Comp. Theophrast. Hist. Pl. iv. 3. Prosper. Alpinus, De Plant. Æg. c. i.: "acaciæ arbores copiosissime in montibus Sinai penes rubrum mare positis proveniunt. Hieronymus ad Joel iv.: "quae ligna in locis cultis et in Romano solo *absque Arabiae solitud ne* non inveniuntur." Forskal, Flora Æg. Arab. p. lvi.

3 Comp. Heeren's Ideen ii. 2, p. 354—393.

4 Comp. Heeren, i. 2, p. 41, ff., p. 118, ff.

reaches back to the oldest periods of history.[1] Besides, the entire relation in which the Hebrews had stood to the Egyptians, requires that we should not think of them as being in a wholly wild condition, which would even place them beneath the nomads of Arabia. The people had acquired property, in part at least, in Egypt; the description in Ex. xxxii. leaves us no doubt as to the possessions and even wealth that they had gained there. They had not gone empty-handed out of Egypt, but richly provided with silver and gold (xii. 36.). So also it was impossible but that the skill of the Egyptians in the working of metals and leather, in weaving, in architecture, &c.,[2] must have had an improving influence on the Hebrews. We have an express testimony to this effect, out of the Pentateuch, in 1 Chron. iv. 21, which is of the more importance here, as it is connected with a genealogy, and speaks of certain families being exclusively devoted to the art of manufacturing byssus.[3] Neither is there any kind of artistic skill that can be named as requisite in the construction of the Tabernacle, which cannot also be shown to have been the possession of the Egyptians. But as to the time of completing the whole of it, it is foolish, in reference to that, to compare the long period that Solomon's Temple was in building, with the time the Tabernacle was. The distinction between the two cases is manifest; we have only to take into account the material of cedar wood as compared with that of acacia wood, and the circumstance that in the one building foreign artizans were employed, and in the other Israelitish, at once to recognize the difference. In general, the adduction of this argument as a demonstrative one can only cause surprise, as we know nothing as to how many workmen were employed on the Tabernacle, how great their skill was, how simply or with how much art the work itself was performed, &c. It has also been advanced as an argument, that Solomon was obliged to send for Phœnician workmen, which supposes the prevalence, even in the age of Solomon, of a great deficiency as to skill in architecture, so that such a structure as the Tabernacle can hardly be attributed to the efforts of the Hebrews. Here again the influence of Egypt,

1 Comp. Gen. xxxvii. 28; Num. xxxi. 47, ff.; Judg. viii. 21, ff.; Ezek. xxvii. 16. See Heeren, i. 2, p 105, ff.

2 See thereon Heeren, ii. 2, p. 367, ff. Schlosser, Universal-Gesch. i. p. 189, ff. Müller, Archäol. d. Kunst, § 219, ff. Hirt, Gesch. d. bild. Künste b. d. Alten, p. 7, ff.

3 Comp. on the worthlessness of this objection, Herbst, l. cit. p. 21, sq.

and the difference of the two structures, are quite left out of sight. And what hinders us to suppose that the Hebrews subsequently fell back in architecture? Or does Solomon's proceeding presuppose in general such a want of cultivation among the Hebrews, as it is thought to do? "Si reges Persarum (Herbst appropriately remarks, p. 23) magna ædificia exstruenda curabant, architectos Bactrios adsciebant; nemo vero inde conjecerit Persas penitus fuisse rudes artis, ædificia minoris molis et tentoria fabricandi." Besides, from such passages also as 1 Kings vii. 13, ff.; 2 Chron. ii. 8, ff., the express opposite of that assertion is evident. 3. It is a problem in exposition, it is said, to understand the structure and combination of the parts of this building. Vater, to whom De Wette appeals on this point, by no means decides so hastily as at once to ascribe to the author a "forgetfulness of mechanical laws," the imaginary plan of a "miraculous structure." He remarks very justly, on the contrary, that we are not in a condition to form always a clear idea of the connection of the various parts, because of the obscurity of the greater part of the architectural expressions that occur here.[1] When this admission is made beforehand, all such deductions as have been referred to are exceedingly arbitrary, and, in the department of criticism, the argument itself must entirely fall to the ground. 4. The argument that charges the Pentateuch with two different representations of the Tabernacle would be the most important and decisive contribution in favour of the mythical view, supposing it were better founded than the others. It is in Ex. xxxiii. 7, ff., that this anomalous view of a simpler kind of Tabernacle is said to be found, and this peculiarity of the narrative is said to be plainly pointed out by the unconnected and isolated position in which it stands. Now that which gave occasion to this arrangement was the idolatry of the people, their obstinacy. To form an aid then to the people, and to afford them a suggestion of the future revelation of the glory of Jehovah in the Tabernacle, so that they should by this means be preserved from fresh attempts at idolatry, that preliminary tent was erected by Moses. Its object is stated in the words: "every one that sought Jehovah, went forth to the tent of the congregation," which was consequently different from the Tabernacle, as is proved by the

1 Comment. i., p. 107,

total absence of sacrifices; and the means of obtaining that object in receiving answers from Jehovah, was the mediating ministration of Moses, to whom divine revelations were here communicated. That tent was therefore only the continuation of the external representation of God's revelation by Moses; and it was so far a fresh step in advance, as circumstances made it advisable that Moses should not be longer absent from the people. At the same time there was certainly involved in it a reference to the Tabernacle, though not immediately and primarily; but the act rather appears to be the intermediate step for bringing about both things, the revelation of God to Moses, and Jehovah's dwelling in the Tabernacle. It is thus quite in its proper place here.

If we enquire now into the object which the so-called inventor must have associated with the plan of the Mosaic Tabernacle, we receive for answer, that he wished to represent the pattern of the Temple of Solomon, as that was ascribed, together with all the arrangements of divine service, to the great subject of religious patriotic fictions, Moses. Such a pretended object, however, is even when considered in itself an utterly absurd idea. For if we would conceive of such an apologetic design being earnestly cherished, we cannot think of any other author than one belonging to the age of Solomon itself: none but such a one could feel an inducement and interest, to wish to justify and honour the new institution of his time. But such a one, supposing there was really no such pattern of the Temple, would have made himself ridiculous in the eyes of all his contemporaries. To suppose an author of a later date, however, is what we cannot venture to do, even for this reason, that to such a one the Temple of Solomon itself must have been a sufficient ideal, so that he could not have gone beyond that given historical standing-point. In that case we could only expect something still more glorious, like what Ezekiel's prophecy describes, but not such a descent to the first defective beginnings. How could that have afforded any gratification to the national vanity that is supposed to have influenced him?

With that pretended object of the author, however, the criticism of our opponents has lost a point more than they themselves appear to think. If the Temple was really a copy of the Tabernacle, and the latter was the pattern, it stands related to the former as its historical supposition just as much as that again does to the Temple

of Ezekiel. The progressive relation in which the Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple stand to one another, is evident; the latter is the more advanced form, the grander embellishment of the more simple tent erected in the desert.[1] On the other hand, less weight would require to be laid on the Egyptian origin of the Tabernacle. It must indeed be acknowledged that there exists an analogy with Egyptian customs in the plan and division of the tent, in the internal arrangement, and also in the shew-bread, the ark of the covenant, the cherubim, &c.[2] This is still more distinctly exhibited in many of the things pertaining to the Sanctuary, such as the dress of the priests, and the relation of a high priest to the rest of the priests. But it is also not to be overlooked, on the other hand, that the peculiar theocratic idea could appropriate for this purpose only the general outline, since in this case also the form stood in the closest connection with the mythological idea; hence, while modern criticism acknowledges the influence of Egyptian symbolism on the Hebrew arrangement of the Tabernacle only in a restricted sense,[3] it has certainly been guilty of the same partiality, since what was hitherto considered to be Egyptian influence, it will now have regarded as Phœnician. But it negatives itself, since it must admit that even from that quarter every thing can by no means be derived. It should thus have been led to advance consistently to the only correct idea, that what may be regarded equally well as Phœnician or Egyptian property, bears in it a *more general* character, the cause and origin of which can only be known from the peculiar idea, to which all that was formal was subordinated. The inconsistency of Vatke's criticism becomes very manifest, in the discussion concerning the cherubim particularly. He sees himself there compelled to think of the Upper-Asiatic ideas of griffins, and very arbitrarily disputes the existence of any analogy with Egyptian mythology. That mythology, however, is no less to be taken into account as well as that of all the other nations of antiquity; and such a limitation is so arbitrary, that it is rather by a combined view of the whole of Heathen antiquity that a complete fundamental theory, exhaustive of the subject, concerning those compound animal forms, can be arrived at. It is therefore only in a

1 Comp. Von Meyer, Der Tempel Salomo's, p. 8, ff.
2 Comp. Heeren, Id. ii. p. 301, ff.
3 See Vatke, l. c. p. 323, ff.; comp. p 681, ff.

general respect that this circumstance is of importance in reference to the erection of the Tabernacle, and everything belonging to the sanctuary; as it involves at any rate the supposition of a period in the history of the Israelites, when it was possible for the heathen element to obtain a formal adoption into the theocratic system, so as to appear pervaded and transformed into a nobler shape by the theocratic principle. Now, in this respect the age of Solomon lies under an essential disadvantage in comparison with that of Moses. It was only at a time when the formation of the internal constitution of the people as a covenant-people was still going on, that there was room to represent what was theocratic as related on an equal footing to what was simply human and universal; but this was impossible after the arrangements of society had assumed a fixed form, when all that remained was to carry out farther the institutions given at an earlier period.

But we must maintain the Mosaic origin of the history of the ancient sanctuary, because of its internal character likewise. If the idea of a later author having undertaken to draw out a sketch of the original pattern of Solomon's temple must in itself seem startling, it must appear all the more strange from the way in which that author has then executed his idea. 1. Our author betrays not the least trace that he is presenting to his readers a form of his fancy. The plan of the whole proves this most conclusively. Were it sheer invention, we should hardly have here such a combination, wrought out in exact historical progress according to the execution of the work, so that the matter is now evidently broken into fragments, and united only by the progress of the undertaking itself.[1] This is most distinctly evident from the conjunction of the plan given with the execution of it. This form is suitable only on the supposition that we have before us an authentic description of the fact. "The description that is given in the account of the execution (Eichhorn remarks) is more exact and precise, while that given in the plan is more indefinite and prolix, as nothing else could be expected from a writer who was not himself an artist." This is plain *e. g.* from the comparison of xxviii. 5, 6 with xxxix. 3, of xxx. 18 with xxxviii. 8, of xxviii. 36, ff., with xxxix. 30, 31. It is also because of this very circumstance,[2] that we cannot

1 Comp. Eichhorn, 3, p. 270, ff.

2 See Bleek, Stud. u. Krit. 1831, 3, p. 507, Anmk.

accede to the view, which regards the plan as being the production of Moses, but refers the account of the execution of it to other authorship. We should then certainly be surprised at those discrepancies, and should rather expect an exact verbal repetition. The objections of Bleek are removed by what has already been remarked. 2. But the description is also of such a character, as bearing a precise reference to the condition of things at that period —to the circumstances of the abode in the desert—that we must on that account assign it the rank of a true historical narrative. It has been justly remarked that, supposing it were a later writer who occupied the ground of subsequent circumstances, his plan would necessarily involve an allusion to these. To this department belongs the fact, that the writer nowhere forgets to let us know that the Tabernacle was a portable fabric, comp. xxv. 27, xxvii. 6, 7, xxx. 4, and how it was to be protected against the weather, xxvi. 7, ff. Nowhere does there appear the slightest trace that the writer is thinking of any other structure than this tent, and accordingly such important ornaments as those in the temple of Solomon are here never once hinted at. To this belong also the passages where the priests and their official services are spoken of: they constantly receive special mention as "Aaron," or as "Aaron and his sons," but nowhere the general appellation of priests: see xxvii. 21, xxviii. xxix. xxx. 7, 19, 30. "It is clear that these regulations concerning the priests refer properly only to Aaron and his sons, who acted as priests in the time of Moses. As they stand here, they could not bear an immediate reference to the later temple service, but could be referred to it only by means of an accommodating interpretation, which would also require to define more exactly, how much of this was applicable to the High Priest, and how much to the other priests; for neither of these points is here distinctly defined."[1] In addition to this, there are also allusions which admit of explanation only from an exact acquaintance with the condition of things at that time, especially the mention of those artists who were employed in the construction of the Tabernacle (xxxv. 30, ff.; xxxviii. 22, ff.; xxxvi. 1, ff.), of whom Bezaleel and Aholiab have even their lineage given. Here then the writer must certainly have at least exercised pure invention: it would at any rate argue a peculiar eccentricity both in him and his readers.

1 Bleek, l. c. p. 506.

The opponents of the historical truth of the Pentateuch having, in the portion that we have hitherto been discussing, imagined to themselves an author who writes under priestly influence, must directly find themselves involved by this hypothesis in no little embarrassment, when we examine more closely the remainder of the historical statements in Exodus. The narrative in ch. xxxii. is certainly by no means written under the influence mentioned: what it says concerning Aaron's participation in the idolatrous worship is little adapted to serve as evidence of hierarchical influence on the origin of this history, and the way in which the later Jews endeavour here to screen the High Priest of Israel from blame,[1] shows plainly how unfavourable this book is to any such perverted object. Yet here also recent writers have been determined to find a mere mythus, invented forsooth with the specific aim (by a prophet?) of forming an opposition to that worship of Apis in the kingdom of Israel, which was the prevailing custom there from the time of Jeroboam I.[2] But here our opponents involve themselves in worse perplexity. For surely it might also be asserted with equal justice, that the narrative was written as an apology for a worship of such antiquity, in which Aaron himself took part; for this very point, to which such prominence is given in the history (comp. xxxii. 21, ff.), is entirely passed over by our opponents. For it cannot be said that, by the close of the narrative, this is explained in a hierarchical light; since Moses at any rate represents the prophetic, and Aaron the priestly principle; and thus the history constantly remains anti-hierarchical. We must accordingly ascribe to this account the character of impartiality, and consider the ground of a mythical explanation, advanced by our opponents, as totally inadmissible.

With regard to their objections respecting what is incredible in the present narrative, it all amounts in the main to the question, how Aaron and the people could apostatize so suddenly to idolatrous worship? and this question renders necessary a closer investigation of the idea that lies at the foundation of this worship. That idea, however, is most clearly stated in the section itself: it is a longing for the fulfilment of the promise of Moses, that the God of Israel would go in a visible appearance before them and

[1] See Bochart, Hieroz. i. p. 339, sq. Rosenm.

[2] Comp. De Wette, p. 244, ff. Gramberg. Gesch. d. Rel. Id. i. p. 442, ff. Von Bohlen, p. cviii. Comp. Vatke, p. 186.

conduct them, that moves the people. Jehovah it is who must be that God; it is He who delivered Israel out of Egypt; it is his feast that they intend solemnly to celebrate. But, being devoid of the thought of the true presence of God, the people seek to supply its place by devotion to the worship of nature, and arbitrarily to secure of their own will what Jehovah only in his truth and holiness could grant them. Thus this narrative throws an important light upon the earlier history. The revelation of the living God appears as a fact that was certainly deeply impressed on the mind of the people; even in these acts of apostacy we see it to be so: and so great is the prevalence of this conviction, that they are not anxious for any particular form of worship, but their only desire is, "make us a deity." Thus the less that a special heathen element had taken root among them, the more would they be disposed to regard the most sacred symbol of Egyptian mythology, the form of the ox (welcome to them in their present circumstances), as best adapted to answer their wishes, since in it the highest view of the religion of nature appeared most concentrated. How naturally did the people, as soon as they lost the sense of their higher destiny, always in their longing turn back to Egypt! The present history accordingly testifies, on the one hand the special transgression of the command, to make no likeness of the Deity, and, on the other hand, it supplies as the source of this disobedience the identification of Jehovah with the deities of the religion of nature; and thus it gives evidence in this very departure from the true and living God of the conviction of the existence of such a God, though in a darkened and perverted form. Now such a position is altogether suited to that period, and it is so far from involving any thing isolated and inexplicable, that there is none in which the mind of the people could more naturally be drawn away from the idea of the religion of nature, and be gradually elevated in spirit and in truth to the conception of a God diametrically opposed to that idea. This leads us to see also how the contrast between the two ideas now receives a practical exhibition of the most decided order, evidencing itself according to the character of the Old Testament law in the annihilation and punishment of the opposition.[1] The

[1] It is quite unhistorical, for Bauer in the Zeitsch. f. spek. Theol. i. p. 172, to speak here of Kronos, the ancient national God (?) of the Hebrews. There is certainly no avoiding such arbitrary notions, when instead of allowing history and historical investigation to speak, we content ourselves with a priori theories.

people could not have been punished in the way here related, a revolt would have followed the attempt to carry such a punishment into effect, had they not still been under the influence of that conviction of the Jehovistic principle which we have remarked: but that makes the proceeding of Moses, as well as the conduct of the people, alike consistent and intelligible. The way in which the idol-image was destroyed is characteristic, ver. 20. The general meaning of the symbolical act is clear. The idol-image is first melted down,[1] and then reduced to powder: it is quite destroyed as to its form and nature, and the people are required to drink the water with which the powder has been mingled; which according to the notions of that religion of nature to which they had done homage on this occasion, must have proved the abolition of that very religion, being the greatest offence against it.[2] The casting of the powder into the water refers however likewise most probably to an Egyptian custom,[3] which would confirm in no small degree the importance of the symbolical acts, which thus appropriately completed the process of annihilation directed against the religion of nature.

§ 26. CONTINUATION. HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF LEVITICUS.

Amongst the laws of this book ch. i. to vii. stand in close connection. If we find then in this section traces, pointing decidedly to the Mosaic origin of separate parts, the conclusion must by no means be restricted to these individual portions: we are compelled to demand the same acknowledgment on behalf of the whole. Here, as already in the earlier laws of Exodus, we meet in the first place with the peculiarity, that wherever Priests are spoken of, Aaron and his Sons are almost everywhere named.[4] Farther, the Tabernacle is always represented as the central point of the sacrifices, &c.: everything is referred to that place, and no allusion is made to any other sanctuary. The following are standing phrases: לִפְנֵי

[1] שָׂרַף does not exactly bear the meaning of *comburere*, but the mode of burning must be regarded as defined according to the object, comp. Gen. xi. 3. The proper word for applying to metals is the cognate צָרַף, which does not occur till the later books.

[2] Comp. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 362. Clericus, ad Ex. xxxii. 20.

[3] Comp. Herod. ii. 41: Θάπτουσι δὲ τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας βοῦς τρόπον τόνδε. Τὰς μὲν θηλέας ἐς τὸν ποταμὸν ἀπιᾶσι, &c.

[4] Comp. *e. g.* ch. i. 4, 7, 8, 11; ii. 3; iii. 13; vi. 2, 7, 9, 11, 13; vii. 34, ff. &c.

אהל מועד, or פתח אה מ" and the like.[1] The Israelites are introduced as a certain assembly, which is gathered together (הקהל) (comp. iv. 13, ff.): their heads are mentioned as the זקני העדה (iv. 15) or נשיא iv. 22.[2] Again we meet with forms of expression which refer especially to the abode of the Israelites in the camp and the desert.[3] The circumstances of the period are attended to with equal exactness in other matters. Thus in v. 15, 18, 25 (in Eng. Bible, vi. 6) where valuations are spoken of, these are committed to Moses in the special formula בְּעֶרְכֶּךָ,[4] which not until a later period could be transferred and applied to other persons, as the Priests, to whom this business likewise was assigned along with it. So also in vi. 13, ff. (Eng. Bib. vi. 20), where after some directions concerning the daily sacrifices, it is said: "This is the offering of Aaron and his Sons, which they shall present unto Jehovah on the day of the anointing," &c., and then only in ver. 15 (22) "and the Priest of his Sons that is anointed in his stead shall offer it," &c. This mode of expression cannot be explained on the hypothesis of a post-Mosaic composition: the thought of what should be done on the approaching day of the priestly consecration, prevails throughout; and it is only on this genuine historical standing-point that an explanation is furnished of the otherwise strange expression ביום המשח אתו, ver. 13.[5]

The character of the section being so decided, we can only regard it as a fair admission of what we have asserted, when the opinion is expressed, "that it is certainly not so very improbable a thing that a later writer should have succeeded in transporting himself into the exact historical position."[6] For even this supposition is not sufficient, where a subsequent alteration of the earlier law becomes necessary (comp. *e.g.* chaps. xiv. xvii.): since, if the law in its later form was to obtain credit by the Mosaic origin,

1 Comp. *e. g.* i. 3; iii. 8, 13; iv. 7, 14; vi. 9, 23, &c.

2 Comp. Num. xvi. 2. Michaelis, Mos. R. i. § 45.]

3 Comp. iv. 12, 21, vi. 4. Bleek, in Rosenmüller's Repertorium i. p. 7.

4 Comp. Rosenmüller and Vater on Lev. v. 15. Gramberg also, Gesch. der Rel. Id. i. p. 131, remarks: "Thus the poet remains true to the costume of the age!!"

5 Hence the Arab. Polyglott corrects the expression thus—منذ يوم مسحه "from the day of his anointing." Thus also Rosenmüller explains it, but ungrammatically. Better Geddes in Vater, p. 175.

6 De Wette, Einl. § 149. Anmk. h. Comp. also George, l. c. p. 41.

which was falsely attributed to it, this very form turns out to be quite a perverted one, whereas the only object should have been to exalt the present mode as being the fac simile of the past. In the case supposed, the writer must have made for himself a Mosaic period, but the only imaginable motive for doing so could be no other than the endeavour to identify that with the present. Farther, there is by this a character attributed to our book, which is in general foreign to the habits of the Oriental world, namely the reproduction of the past in a form so entirely objective. And supposing even that it was an imaginative writer that we had here to do with, yet it is only dry legal institutions that are here in question, which besides are supposed to have assumed this shape by degrees! How then did this unity in the mode of presenting them come to be introduced? Finally, such a view could be entertained, only if sufficient reasons for its later composition were deducible from the section itself; but any such reasons are wholly wanting in it,[1] and one is contented with general arguments, which are altogether unsatisfactory, in order to bring these laws, with at least some appearance of a claim, within the general category of later Levitical institutions.

The following section, chaps. viii. to x., which is for the most part historical, is as little to be taken as an invented legend. This is true in particular of the act of the consecration of the Priests, and the instructions given them for their office. The full detail of this narration is sufficiently explained by the circumstance, that it is a contemporary who gives the information. But if we should suppose, that priestly conceit had invented this solemn ceremony to enhance the importance of the order, that which immediately follows would be at once quite in opposition to it. There we are told of the offence of Nadab and Abihu: the object of this "fictionist" must consequently have been the reverse. Besides, in more than

1 We must, it seems, accept as something of this kind, what Hartmann, page 741, remarks on vi. 5, 6 (12, 13), that the appointment there mentioned could not have been fulfilled before the foundation of the Temple, because of—the removal of the Tabernacle from place to place. This is an argument no better than Gramberg's, l. c. p. 128, that the Israelites cannot have had wood enough to keep up the fire!! Did not then the Persians also in their marches constantly have their ever-burning sacred fire with them (Curt. iii. 3; Ammian. Marcell. xxiii. 6)? This very part of the service, however, is that which has its high antiquity confirmed by the accordant practice of all the ancient nations: comp. *e. g.* Pausan. v. 27, 3; 15, 5; viii. 9, 1; 37, 8. Ælian. H. A. x. 50. Dougtæi anall. ss. p. 79, sq.

one instance Aaron neglected what was prescribed in the Law (comp. x. 16, ff. with iv. 22, ff.), which excites the displeasure of Moses, who is satisfied, however, with Aaron's exculpation of himself. Does not this throw utter discredit on every hypothesis of a mythical account? What object could this narrator have had, and what unity is it possible to discover in the presumed mythi? There is, therefore, also no justification for concluding from the miracle in ix. 24 that that also is a mythus,[1] especially as it is a case which has an abundance of analogies on its side in Hebrew history, which none but the same dogmatical prejudice has ventured to treat as untrue and embellished accounts.[2]

In ch. xi.—xiv. the laws relating to purification follow. These also are closely connected together, and here again our decision must be given in favour of the whole, if we meet with the same reference, that we did previously, to the circumstances of the Mosaic period. Such in particular is the nature of the law concerning leprosy, in which every thing refers to the abode of the people in the desert (comp. xiii. 46, xiv. 3, 8), and that condition appears distinguished from their future residence in Canaan, xiv. 33, ff. Thus the author looks forward from a genuine historical standing-point to the future affairs of his nation.[3] In the same way others also of these legal appointments bear the decided mark of being framed at a time, "when all the individuals of the nation were so situated as to be at no great distance from the Tabernacle of the congregation."[4] Uncleanness by an issue of blood, or continued gonorrhœa, and that of women in child-bed, require to be removed and atoned for by the *personal* presentation of offerings in the sanctuary: however insignificant the offering might be, it must still be presented by the giver himself. In such cases would a later age have invented such a law? A law that had no other than an ideal sanction could in reason neither profit the Priests who invented it, nor impose the yoke of obedience on the people. Such a law could be sanctioned only by an ancient sacred custom; nothing but a period, when it had its fulfilment, and of which a lively remembrance was still maintained amongst the people, could admit of such

1 As De Wette does, Beitr. p. 301, ff.

2 Comp. Judg. vi. 21; 1 Kings xviii. 38; 1 Chron. xxi. 26; 2 Chron. vii. 1.

3 Comp. also Bleek, l. c. p. 11, 12.

4 Bleek, in the Stud. u. Krit. l. c. p. 497.

an appointment. Its origin at a later period is altogether incomprehensible.

By thus transporting our minds in a vivid manner to the time of the origin of these laws, and recognizing its complete adaptation to their fulfilment, we do away also with the objection of the artificial structure and hierarchical spirit[1] that is attributed to them. But we must also give attention here to the nature of the laws themselves, and to the principle in which they originate, and which connects them with the Mosaic system, in order to be convinced, that these laws, when they have once taken root amongst a people, and when the principle they involve has been established as the supreme rule, must from their nature bear that character of a seemingly pedantic and artificial speciality. According to the law, the prescription of Levitical purity flows immediately from the idea of Jehovah as being a holy God (xi. 44, xx. 24, ff.); the holiness of the people of Israel, as a kingdom of priests (Ex. xix. 6), is most intimately connected with the holiness of their king. Even as the nation was established and called by God to assume that character, the problem which it had to solve was that of the representation of the divine holiness by purity in all external relations, as the stamp of a mind devoted to God, and consecrated by him. That is the peculiar principle of Hebraism: namely, to represent the internal unity of the life consecrated to God; and to carry it out in the department of external things, so that the latter should be the copy of the internal.[2] Now, although this principle belongs exclusively to Hebraism, yet something analogous to its fundamental idea has been maintained amongst the nations of antiquity, and especially in the East. The Scriptures themselves point out the original source of that idea, since they speak of the distinction of clean and unclean animals as existing long before Moses, and as known in the earliest age. And it is also this very knowledge that we find again to have been most indubitably the common property of other nations; though with them indeed its form is so far perverted, that the con-

1 De Wette, Beitr. p. 278, ff. Bertholdt, Einl. 3, p. 776.

2 Cicero also takes such a view of the Roman law, *caste divos adeunto*, that he says: "Animo videlicet, in quo sunt omnia. Nec tollit castimoniam corporis; sed hoc oportet intelligi; quum multum animus corpori praestet, observeturque ut casta corpora adhibeantur, multo esse in animis id servandum magis. Nam illud vel adspersione aquae vel dierum numero tollitur: animi labes nec diuturnitate evanescere, nec amnibus ullis elui potest." De Legg. ii. 10, 24.

templation of nature is that which is most prominent in it,—the divine is conceived as being presented immediately in nature, in the animal world, which is identified with Deity itself. The profound ethico-dogmatical root of this conception is accordingly the peculiar excellence of the Mosaic system, and on that account we must not regard the conception as one which the people had derived from an external source;[1] on the contrary, its fundamental spiritual idea bears the most decided marks of originality. We can, however, very well conceive how the contact into which Israel was brought with other nations must have had an influence so far as to render necessary, not only the prominent assertion of the theocratic principle, but also the carrying out of it in the department of practical life. But then the residence of the people in Egypt becomes an event of the utmost importance, especially from the position in which Egyptian customs stood to the principle of Hebraism. In Egypt, the idea of purification was principally restricted to the Priests; and indeed the strictness and conscientiousness with which they attended to the ceremonial of their purification, the laws relating to food, &c., formed in the opinion of Herodotus a proof of their *θεοσέβεια*.[2] Hence there arose very properly a necessity for defining this idea in its relation to the theocratic idea. This definition, however, can, no more than the Egyptian, be of an abstract character. Thus we are in this way also led to the necessity of admitting concrete definitions, consisting in the carrying out of the principle in the separate departments of life; and the more that there existed of these appointments previously, the more comprehensive must be the circle of particular objects on which they were now brought to bear. In treating these details, however, we cannot from our standing-point insist on a coincidence with or a deviation from Egyptian customs, since both the one and the other may be regarded as alike existing and combined in the present subject; but our business is simply with the general principle of the necessity of these theocratic institutions, and their agreement with the fundamental principle of the Theocracy.[3]

1 As Von Bohlen, p. 88, and Vatke, p. 549, take up the notion of Persian influence, and suppose the idea to have received its form during the Exile.

2 Comp. Herod. ii. 37. Chæremon in Porphyr. de abstin. iv. § 7. Heeren, Id. ii. 2, p. 132, ff. 166.

3 We would here subjoin the remark, that many of the animals mentioned in Levit. xi. appear to be such as are discoverable only in Egypt or Arabia; and the translation of

The same form, as found in the description of the day of atonement, is worthy of remark. Everything there bears a reference to circumstances in the desert,[1] and the transplanting of the law to the soil of Palestine necessarily introduced a more exact definition and modification of it.[2] In addition to that there is an Egyptian rite, which stands in a remarkable, and certainly not an accidental, relation to the Hebrew rite; according to the ancients, the Egyptians cursed victims in a similar manner, and threw the heads of those that had thus been cursed into the Nile.[3] But when De Wette, Einl. p. 191, remarks that the difficult word לעזאזל must have been obscure to the author himself, the very parallels adduced by him, the distinction between the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings, the Urim and Thummim, only go to prove so much the more clearly the precise character of the Pentateuch, in not giving minute explanations of individual parts of the ritual, but are no evidence whatever of the unintelligibleness of the rite at the time of the writer. His supposition here, however, rests only on the assumption, that Asasel was the appellation of a demon, which can hardly be justified either linguistically or dogmatically.[4] When the word is regarded as an appellative noun, all suspicion of its being unintelligible is removed. Particular importance belongs also to the command concerning the killing of animals before the sanctuary, ch. xvii. Here an express distinction is made between ani-

their names given in the Alexandrine version would appear on that account to deserve particular consideration: *e. g.* the rendering of ינשוף, ver. 17, by ἴβις in the LXX., which must be correct from the connection, where only water-fowl are spoken of, while in Isaiah xxxiv. 11 the word appears to denote quite another sort of bird (see Gesenius in loc. p. 914; comp. also Tychsen, Phys. Syr. p. 102.). So צב, LXX., κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος, ver. 29, the lizard of the Nile, Arab. ضب (comp. Gesenius on Burckhardt, ii. p. 1076, ff. Rödiger. Gloss. Locm. p. 11), with its different species (למינהו); comp. Abdollatif. Mem. Ægyp. p. 42, ed. Paul. So אנפה, ver. 19, LXX., χαράδριος, indigenous in Egypt, see Rosenmüller, Scholl. ad h. l.

1 Comp. xvi. 10, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28. Bleek, in Repert. l. c. p. 8, ff.

2 In reference to the above, the Talmudic prescription concerning the expulsion of the goat, &c., is instructive: see Tr. Joma, p. 147, ed. Sheringham.

3 Her. ii. 39: κεφαλὴ δὲ κείνη πολλὰ καταρησάμενοι φέρουσι, etc. Plutarch, De Is. et Os. p. 363: διὸ τῇ μὲν κεφαλῇ τοῦ ἱερείου καταρασάμενοι καὶ ἀποκόψαντες εἰς τὸν πόταμον ἐρρίπτουν πάλαι, νῦν δὲ τοῖς ξένοις ἀποδίδονται. We find this rite represented on the monuments also; comp. Descript. de l' Eg. t. i. p. 73.

4 Comp. Tholuck, Das A. T. im N. T. (Beil. z. Comm. üb. d. Hebr. Br.) p. 79, 80. [Tholuck's Essay, entitled the Old Testament in the New, in the Appendix to his Commentary on the Hebrews; translated in Clark's Biblical Cabinet.]

mals that should be slain in the camp and out of the camp (ver. 3), and it is forbidden to kill an animal any where else than in the camp before the sanctuary; that which was killed there should be eaten as a peace-offering in honour of Jehovah. The reason of this law, however, is found in the worship of the Goats, with which the Israelites became acquainted in Egypt,[1] to which they might be especially tempted to present sacrifices in the desert, as the abode of those demons who had the shape of a Goat (Satyrs, שְׂעִירִים ver. 6, 7.). The law could not in this form be made applicable in Canaan, and accordingly required to undergo a subsequent alteration, Deut. xii.[2] It is certainly not clear that Ex. xx. 21 leads to the conclusion that the law there given could not be Mosaic,[3] for that appointment also is but a temporary one, as being given before the erection of the Tabernacle, which is made plain enough by the introduction of the latter fact; and hence as that command in Exodus cannot have been post-Mosaic, so neither can the one in Leviticus, which is likewise temporary.

The Mosaic constitution having thus far been clearly proved to rest on a genuine historical foundation, we have to institute a similar examination of the next section of Leviticus, chaps. xviii.—xxvii. We here encounter at once an important consideration, namely, the emphatic reference that is made to the possession of the promised land. No inference indeed can be drawn from this, taken by itself, either for or against the Mosaic composition of the piece. But our business is with the mode in which this reference to Canaan is put forth, whether it proceeds from the standing-point of the residence in that country, or from that which contemplates the residence in it as future? In the latter case, the standing-point is evidently the Mosaic. For the Lawgiver having led the people as far as that point, which we have hitherto been viewing, could not possibly stop short there: that which had already been fulfilled was too great, not to require that the final aim of this legislation should now be brought more closely before the eyes of the people. But the great fact, from which all these laws proceed as their starting-point, and which they present to the people as their strongest motive for their

1 Comp. Marck, Exercitt. Scriptur. p. 452, sq. Bochart, Hieroz. i. 2, 43. Jablonski, Panth. Æg. i. p. 272, sq. Gesenius and Hitzig on Is. xiii. 21.

2 Comp. Bleek's excellent remarks in the Stud. u. Krit. l. c. p. 402, ff.

3 So De Wette, Einl. p. 191.

fulfilment, is the deliverance from Egypt: comp. *e. g.* xix. 34, 36; xxii. 33; xxiii. 43; xxv. 38, 55, &c. The proper standing-point of the whole is most clearly exhibited by xviii. 3, "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of *Canaan*, whither I bring you, shall ye not do," &c. And while the Lawgiver thus directs the people's attention to the land left behind them, and represents their departure from it as the most practical proof of the divine purpose, that Israel should be a nation like no other amongst the heathen, he extends his glance at the same time to the future. Evidence must be afforded in Canaan likewise, that Israel was a holy nation, and Jehovah a holy God. Thus the people must be firmly convinced, on the one hand, that this land was their inheritance, because of the divine promise; and, on the other hand, that it must be taken possession of in the name of Jehovah, and that the conflict of the divinely elected people with the nations "which the land should spue out," should begin. Such is the aim of every thing in these laws; the abominations and sins of the Canaanites, and their extirpation on that account determined by God, are kept before the people, comp. xviii. 24, 27—30; the land is ordinarily described in these terms, "the land is full of wickedness" (וְמָדָה); their abhorrence of the possessions of the Canaanites was to go so far, as that they should consider the trees that were planted during the first three years to be *unclean*, xix. 23—25 (עֲרֵלִים, properly *uncircumcised*); but Jehovah would lead his own people into a fair inheritance, where the people should live separate from all others, xx. 22—27, &c. Now this point of view is such as we can ascribe only to the Mosaic period, and to the Lawgiver himself. For the whole of the command refers here primarily only to the entrance into Canaan. The encouragement of Israel to war with the nations, on which the anger of God rests, and the stipulation of their own safety and prosperity, secured to them by Jehovah, are the main points of view to which the series of laws constantly returns. Such a proceeding, however, cannot be imagined in a later writer. To what purpose should he invent fiction with such a view, at a time when Canaan had long been held in possession? To what purpose should he have made all these laws bear this kind of reference to the occupation of the land? We should rather say, that no other person can write in this manner than one who is himself just about

to attempt the great achievement, in firm faith in the God of Israel, the rock of Jacob.

When we have sufficiently ascertained this general fundamental view, the details of these laws will also have light enough thrown on them. This is especially the case with the mention that is made of the idolatry of the Canaanites. The prohibition of it is not only insisted on in general (xix. 4, xxvi. 1), but also particular idolatrous practices (xix. 27, 28, xxi. 5), the worship of Molech especially (xviii. 21, xx. 1, ff.), and of Astarte (xix. 29), are forbidden. In disputing the Mosaic authorship, it will not do to be satisfied here with the general counter observation, that these superstitions did not exist till after the time of Moses.[1] For, in the first place, we should here bear in mind the truth of the proverb, In pravitatibus insignis est generis humani similitudo—an expression which may be especially applied to the worship of nature and idolatrous observances. As the Israelites had become acquainted with these in Egypt, and had themselves sunk into many idolatries, the language here employed could by no means be unintelligible to them, even though it referred to a differently modified form of such worship. This must the more certainly have been the case, since, as we have previously remarked, the form of idolatry was always a matter of comparative indifference to them, owing to the knowledge of Jehovah and his worship, which they had derived from their fathers; it was consequently to the impressions of idolatry in general that they were exposed, without having adopted it in any particular mode, or having allied it with their whole existence. The history in the Pentateuch itself shows how necessary these commands were for the people, who so readily attached themselves to what was foreign, and thoughtlessly cast away the blessing entrusted to them.

The people were to live with all their thoughts in the future, in the land of promise. It was only thus that they could be able to endure the hardships of the present time, and to regard these in their true light. But they were to cherish this longing in a right manner, by concentrating their thoughts upon the one point of God's grace and truth. Hence the law concerning the circle of feasts in ch. xxiii. acquires so special an importance from the combination of civil agricultural matters with religious. The latter point

1 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. p. 280, Einl. § 159.

of view is plainly made prominent in it. It is quite a perversion to seek to discover the original meaning of the feasts in their connection with the former, regarding *e. g.*, the feast of first-fruits as the original feast of the Passover.[1] This would be to misapprehend entirely the whole contents of the chapter. We here receive no information at all as to the proper meaning of *e.g.* the Passover, any more than where the day of atonement is spoken of: that is evidently presupposed; and while the passage thus regards the moral reference of these popular observances as being defined by what precedes, it brings that into harmony with their external life and physical existence. Thus the Lawgiver here also maintains an historical position towards the people: the earthly possession appears precisely as a subordinate thing, whose worth lies solely in its relation to Jehovah, and specially to the display of his glory in the nation. In this respect the account of the feast of Tabernacles at the close of ch. xxiii. is particularly important. The mind of the Lawgiver is completely occupied with the thought of the deliverance from Egypt: this feast must have a reference to the abode in the desert; the proofs that God has given of himself there must not be forgotten by future generations. Here also we stand wholly on the ground of the Mosaic period, and the standing-point of Moses.

This point of view, however, receives its proper completion by the consideration of ch. xxv. and xxvi. For the standing-point hitherto occupied by the Lawgiver cannot be understood in its full extent, without our conceding to him a truly *prophetic* mode of contemplation, by means of which he transfers himself to the future times of the nation. We could hitherto only show how this prophetic standing-point has its point of departure in the present (the Mosaic period), and originates in that. But here we have now the most striking evidence of the higher prophetical point of view, which alone made it possible to bring the present and the future in such a way into their right relation to one another. The consecration of the whole law, its sublime application to the entire department of the life of the nation as a nation set apart for God, is the law relating to the Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee (ch. xxv.). Even there the language of legal appointment passes into the prophetic style of promise, xxv. 18, ff. But the Lawgiver is also fully aware, that

[1] As for instance George does in the writings already referred to; see on the other side also § 23.

the people will not adhere to these his commandments, and that Jehovah himself will fulfil his law of the Sabbath in his own way, when it is violated by the people (xxvi. 34.)[1] Thus in the law itself, prominence is given to the important prophetic aspect of it. But at the same time the language embraces the entire future condition of the people; their exile on account of their disobedience, their sufferings and deliverance from them, xxvi. 41, ff. Modern criticism here will have it, because mention is made of the exile, that there is an *oraculum post eventum*, and on that account denies that it belongs to the age of Moses.[2] But this involves, in the first place, a complete misunderstanding of the section itself. Amongst the misfortunes that were to befall the disobedient and rebellious nation, there is certainly mentioned their dispersion and their loss of the holy land; but this threatening forms only a part of the mass of calamities denounced; comp. xxvi. 19, ff. It would be only in case that single divine punishment received exclusive prominence, that the partiality of the mode of treatment could supply a reason for the opinion referred to; but, as it is, we have to do with a description that embraces the entire history of the nation. Consequently, if that view is to be consistently carried out, it cannot stop short with the event of the exile. For the return from the exile is also included in this prediction; and on the above hypothesis that also must be regarded as an oracle written after the event. This, however, would be overreaching one's object indeed. Hence one prefers to stop short half way, which is certainly the easiest mode of evading a difficulty. Finally, in every prophetic portion the accounts and descriptions of the present, and those of the future, must be well distinguished. Nothing but arbitrary dogmatical assumption and prejudice can affirm that the latter should be taken as the standard, by which to determine the date of the composition of a prophetical piece. Thus it is when one here sets out with the principle, that the Hebrews first learned the possibility of an exile by experience, and therefore that all the prophetic announcements

1 This is at the same time the most striking proof, that, however we may recognize the *ideal* character of that law—for such it must have from its entire position—it was no "*enthusiastic fancy*," as De Wette thinks, Beitr. p. 285.

2 Comp. Vater, iii. p. 639, 640. Gesenius, de Pent. Sam. p. 6. De Wette, Einl. § 159, &c.—Bertholdt, Einl. iii. p. 794, ff., has very well shown that it cannot be said, that Moses could not have mentioned such a punishment from ignorance of it, since it was a very ancient measure of oriental despotism.

of it must invariably have arisen only from the experience that had been had of it. This would be to declare war against all prophecy in general, and to deny the very existence of it as such, consequently to abandon the domain of criticism. It is only the description given of the present, only the starting-point of the prophecy as determined by that, which can supply a just criterion of the date of its composition. On that, however, the section furnishes clear enough information. According to it, the nation is one that has been led out of Egypt, xxvi. 13, and that is allied with Jehovah, partly by the ancient covenant formed with the Patriarchs, partly by the adoption of the people at their departure (xxvi. 42, 45.). This account of the circumstances of the time leads us unquestionably to the Mosaic age.

We have yet another proof of the historical basis of the section in ch. xxiv. 10, ff. De Wette himself confesses that "this fragment bears the stamp of locality and originality." (Beitr. p. 308.). We find here a man, whose genealogy is exactly stated, give utterance to blasphemies. He is born of a mixed marriage, a circumstance which contributes not a little to account for his offence. The prohibition of blasphemy had been delivered (Ex. xxii. 28), but the punishment had not been fixed, which is done in consequence of this fact. These, however, are most decisive features, which could not be looked for except in a faithful historical narrative. But, on the other hand, it is urged—1. that in connection with this matter, laws that are quite foreign to it are introduced, vers. 17—22. On several accounts the repetition of these laws, part of which had previously been published (Ex. xxi. 12), was not irrelative. Partly, because the prohibition of self-revenge, that is, murder, which was nearly connected with this occurrence (ver. 10), was inculcated in them; partly, because they presented the punishment and the crime of blasphemy in their proper relation to crimes committed against men and beasts; lastly, because this case made clear the common law respecting foreigners and born Hebrews (comp. ver. 16 with 22.). Hence this circumstance serves to recommend especial caution in forming conclusions concerning the irrelativeness of laws, which is a still more rash proceeding, where the special historical occasion of them is not mentioned. 2. It is urged that in Num. xv. 32, ff., a similar "anecdote" occurs; such then, it is conjectured, was the author's manner of introducing his

laws. The diversity of the two histories is clear enough. Their agreement in this point, that the Israelites ask counsel of Moses in doubtful instances, is founded in the nature of the case. It is only when one thinks it dubious, as De Wette does, that Moses should here wait for a divine revelation, and allow it to decide, and not his own will, that one can be disposed to look with suspicion on the account. To imagine a reason, however, for that special kind of invention is quite impossible.

§ 27. CONTINUATION. CRITICISM OF NUMBERS I.—XX.

At the very commencement of this book we have the most decisive evidence of its being a Mosaic document. The first thing we meet with here is a numbering of the people. If we refer to what precedes, we shall find the command for this in Ex. xxx. 12, ff. The result of the census that was taken in the first year is stated in Ex. xxxviii. 26. The total which is there brought forward agrees exactly with the present, Num. i. 46. This plainly shews that the census must have been one and the same. This, however, appears inadmissible, because of the different chronological statements. But when the matter is more closely considered, we discover a complete agreement between the two accounts. The census in the first year was required in order to levy the impost for the erection of the Tabernacle; the other, to decide the order of the encampment and march. The latter object did not require a census properly so called. All that was necessary was, to have a review of the tribes, and, as the former census was made the basis, it is evident that it was only a review of the numbers of each tribe that was designed. It is clear from the text itself that this is no arbitrary opinion.[1] Prominent expression is here given to the fact, that the new numbering was made למשפחתם לבית אבותם, i. 2, 18. This was the only necessary addition to the first numbering. But that the latter was made use of, is both probable in itself, and is confirmed by the agreement of the sum total in each. We have here at bottom a census, only suited in its plan to different objects.—If we look farther to the second numbering that was instituted towards the end of the abode in the desert, we meet there with a remark-

1 Comp. Michaelis, De cens. Hebr. § 2. Eichhorn 3, p. 286, ff.

able difference. Some tribes have increased, others have diminished. The difference in the entire body amounts to about 800. With respect to this also we must regard it as maintaining a suitable proportion, when we take into account the continued abode of the people, and their destruction in many ways. Thus its general position fully sustains the historical character of this section; any thought of invention being practised here is merely ridiculous: an inventor would certainly not have paid such strict regard to the historical relation of the three numberings to one another, especially when the exactness of the account is discoverable only by a careful examination of circumstances.

In general, no imaginable ground of explanation whatever can be adduced here, where mere numbers are in question, on the hypothesis of a fictitious composition.[1] For as to De Wette's saying, that "one wished to give details, and genealogies had a great interest for the Israelities;" yet that is no motive for such a fiction; for the object and the fulfilment have here no sort of proportion to one another. We must then suppose that the writer had a mere delight in fictions of the sort, that he took a pleasure in amusing himself, as Eichhorn says, with something that was purely fictitious. But that were absurd. It is opposed also by another circumstance. The numbers that we find here are undoubtedly round numbers; as the units constantly, and the tens even for the most part, are wanting. This has been regarded as a mark of arbitrariness, a conjectural distribution of the main sum. But, on the contrary, a fictitious writer, such as the present is represented to have been, would have here attempted to give his deception some colour of probability by an opposite proceeding, passing himself off as possessed of exact information. If he arbitrarily invented the hundreds and the thousands, he could do the same with the tens and the units. He must, however, at least have had a good understanding of the art of calculation. A sufficient explanation of his procedure here is supplied only by supposing that we possess here an authentic list. Detail was here regarded as being not so important; a general computation of the whole was all that was proposed, and therefore Moses gives the more exact number only where something depends upon it, see iii. 39, 43. Thus the difficulties of the section confirm its authentic character. A deceiver must neces-

[1] Comp. Vater, 3, p. 551, ff. De Wette, Beitr. p. 323, ff. Von Bohlen, p. lxxviii.

sarily have tried to conceal these difficulties as much as possible, so as not to betray himself. This is especially true of the proportion of the first-born to the total sum. According to the statement iii. 43, there must have been only one first-born computed in forty-two males. The proper solution of this difficulty is that of J. D. Michaelis,[1] that this statement supplies a proof that at that time polygamy must have prevailed to an unusual extent amongst the Israelites, and a like conclusion is supplied by the genealogies in Chronicles.[2] For in that case the proportion of the first-born to the other children, is regulated by the Hebrew usage that the first-born must be such on the father's, as well as the mother's side: see Gen. xlix. 3, 4; Deut. xxi. 15, ff.; Ps. cv. 36; Num. i. 20. That this also related to the purchasing of exemption from priestly service, is clear from Ex. xxii. 28, xxxiv. 20, where it is said בְּכוֹר בָּנֶיךָ "the first-born of thy sons," where of course only one of the sons can be thought of as the *primogenitus*. This meaning must also not be restricted by the phrase that is frequently subjoined פֶּטֶר רֶחֶם, Num. iii. 12, for this addition is to give prominence to primogeniture on the maternal side. This latter, however, alone could not make one the first-born of the family; for that, being the first-born on the father's side also was an essential requisite.[3] Accordingly, it is only from this passage that a conclusion can be drawn as to the historical condition of the people, which is confirmed also by notices elsewhere. This is the opposite of every thing like arbitrary invention. Farther, the statement of the number of the Levites in iii. 39, at 22,000 men, does not agree with that of the numbers of the three Levitical families, which gives the sum of 22,300 men, iii. 22, 28, 34. Consequently the 300 Levites must not have been appropriated to the redemption of the rest (comp. v. 46.). This is a very important circumstance. If there were an imposition here, the numbers would naturally have been made alike, so as not to give occasion to the question, in so close proximity, as to the difference of those sums. At any rate this circumstance, which may yet be most naturally explained by the supposition, that

1 De censibus Hebr. § iv. v.

2 Comp. especially 1 Chron. vii. 4, and J. D. Michaelis, on the laws of Moses respecting marriage, p. 308, ff.

3 Comp. Gesenius, Thes. i. p. 206. Consequently Vater's reasoning, which has little weight in general, is incorrect, 3, p. 12, ff.

those 300 Levites were themselves first-born,[1] speaks only in favour of the genuineness of that narrative. To contemporaries, and even at a somewhat later period, there could be no obscurity on the point, which is here presupposed as known.

But De Wette charges the whole account concerning the selection of the Levites with being of a mythical character; according to him, everything stated in the Pentateuch both concerning the revenues and rights of this tribe, as well as its functions, is doubtful, various, and uncertain tradition.[2] The practical document which bears the strongest evidence against the view that such obscurity prevails respecting the origin of the priestly tribe, is the distribution of the Levitical cities, Num. xxxv. (comp. Jos. xxi.). This is acknowledged and admitted even by De Wette. But he will then have it that there are other passages of a contradictory nature concerning the revenues of the Levites. Let us here examine everything in the Pentateuch that relates to that matter. Leviticus contains many appointments as to the share of the *Priests* in the sacrifices, shewbread, &c., but the Levites are referred to in this connection only in xxv. 32, 33, where their cities are spoken of. This involves the requirement that the sequel should supply more precise appointments respecting attention to the Levites. Now this is done in Numbers. Those appointments also could not be delivered before the actual establishment of the Levites in their office, and their adoption as a ransom for the first-born (Num. viii.). Now in Lev. xxvii. 30, the general appointment was made, that the tenth should be sacred to Jehovah, which then receives its more precise explanation in Num. xviii. It is there fixed what revenues should be assigned to the tribe of Levi instead of a certain inheritance (חלק, נחלה), such as the other tribes received, and those revenues were the tithes. Now it is clear that this cannot imply that the Levites were to possess no distinct habitation at all; for every where that which is spoken of is only a separate portion of their own as a tribe, such as the other tribes obtained. Consequently the declaration referred to of the earlier law respecting the habitations of the Levites, required a more precise definition. This too is given in ch. xxxv.

1 Comp. Lilienthal, Gute Sache der Offenb. 3, p. 103. Rosenmüller, Scholl. ad. iii. 39.
2 Beitr. 2, p. 327—338, comp. Vater 3, p. 500 ff.

That this was not regarded as a regular inheritance, is plain at once from the command that the Israelites should give the Levites "cities to dwell in of the inheritance of their possession," and likewise for the support of their cattle, from the defined territory which was acknowledged to be their own. With this Deuteronomy exactly agrees. There also it is distinctly mentioned that the tribe of Levi possesses no inheritance (x. 9, xiv. 27, xviii. 1), but that the Levites should dwell in their own cities amongst the rest of the Israelites.[1] No farther mention is made of the revenues of the Levites, which is quite natural, as they had been sufficiently defined already in previous laws: there is only a general injunction, in accordance with the character of the book, not to forsake the Levite; xii. 19, xiv. 27. But in Deut. xii. 15, in reference to the earlier command in Lev. xvii., an alteration is made respecting the killing of cattle, by which the priests were deprived of an important portion of their income: by the abrogation of the first ordinance the Israelites were released from the obligation of presenting every animal as a thank-offering. Hence as an indemnification for that, it is now prescribed that in Canaan a tenth should be applied to common sacrificial feasts, to which the poor in particular, and also—quite in accordance with what has been already remarked—the Levites, were to be invited.[2] These passages, as it is very clear, do not treat at all of fixed revenues, but only of an act of kindness that was to be shown as well to the poor, to strangers, to widows and orphans. No contradiction of the preceding is indicated by a single syllable: the circumstance rather leads us to the supposition that there were two tenths, the first assigned to the Levites for their support, and the second devoted to feasts, in which the Levites also must participate in accordance with the whole of their position.[3] But it is said that

1 Hence the expression—"The Levite that is within thy gates" (xii. 12, xiv. 27), *i. e.* in thy cities, comp. באחד שעריך, xvi. 5, and the Lexx. s. v. שער. De Wette, on the contrary, is of opinion that the expression refers to their dwelling together in the same cities!!

2 Comp. Deut. xii. 17—19; xiv. 22—29; xxvi. 12—15.

3 This also was the way in which that law was understood by the Jews in every age; comp. Nehem. xiii. 10; Tob. i. 7—*τὴν δεκάτην ἐδίδουν τοῖς υἱοῖς Λευὶ—καὶ τὴν δευτέραν δεκάτην ἀπεπρατιζόμην*, &c. So also the Talmudists. Comp. Selden, de decimis, in Clericus, Comment. append. p. 628, sq. Reland, Antiqq. Sac. p. 354, sq. De Wette's idea (p. 334) is truly ridiculous, that the above were too enormous advantages for the Levites to possess. Yet we shall see that, in point of fact, the Levites were poor, if we compare the revenues and possessions of the priestly castes among other

contradictions are discoverable also relating to the functions of the Priests: that in Deuteronomy the appellations *Levites* and *Priests* have the same import, which is deduced from the designation הכהנים הלויים; that there the Levites are not represented as the servants and guard of the sanctuary, but that the whole tribe of Levi is represented as a priestly tribe. This assertion does not well agree with the previous one, which described Deuteronomy as employing a very subdued tone respecting the claims and revenues of the Levites.[1] But modern criticism is very little troubled about such self-contradictions. But do not the Levites appear in Deuteronomy also as servants of the Sanctuary? Deut. x. 8, xxxi. 9, ff., expressly affirm it. It is true that there the distinction between the functions of the Levites, and those that were properly the Priests', is not explained, but is presupposed; for it was set forth with sufficient precision in preceding portions. As to the meaning of the phrase כהנים לויים, it cannot possibly be "the Levites who are Priests," but only "the Priests who are Levites." Had the author regarded the two words as synonymous, he would not have joined them together. His intention, on the contrary, is to mark the legitimacy of the Priests in opposition to all Priests who were not Levitical, and thus the expression *Levitical Priests* is exactly in its place in Deuteronomy; for there the whole tribe of Levi had assumed a definite relation to the Priests who had been selected out of it; while, before the adoption of the whole tribe, it was only the sons of Aaron that could be spoken of. But that the author knew well the distinction between the two, is clear from xviii. 1, where the כהנים לויים appear in connection with the כל-שבט לוי, and are expressly distinguished from it; xviii. 8, 6. But in Numbers, also, it is said that all the statements concerning the Levites are not in accordance; comp. iv. 2, 3 with viii. 24. Now, the one passage treats of the transportation of the Tabernacle, for which service the attainment of the thirtieth year was requisite; the second treats in general of service in the sanctuary, where the period of service was to begin with the twenty-fifth year. Are not these statements perfectly accordant?

nations, especially the Egyptians: comp. Heeren. ii. 2, p. 180, ff., or the Hellenes; see Kreuser, der Hell. Priesterstaat, p. 22, ff., &c.

[1] Hence George also, l. c., p. 45. ff., considers the legislation of Deuteronomy as of earlier date; which is certainly the greatest blunder into which modern criticism could fall, in its arbitrary decisions.

Thus the statements of the Pentateuch concerning the Levites bear throughout the stamp of unity, and it only remains that we should examine the view, that the passage Num. i.—x. is only a *supplement* to the books of Exodus and Leviticus.[1] It has been shown above that this is not proved by the numbering of the people, which, on the contrary, is an advance in the history. But the portions chs. iii. iv. must "perhaps" belong to the time of Levit. viii., and ch. vii. be joined "immediately" to Ex. xl. But chs. iii. and iv. belong to Num. i. and ii., for the numbering of the Levites stands in close connection with the numbering of the entire nation, and the injunctions respecting the transportation of the sacred Tent bear an intelligible sense, and find their proper place only here, where the decamping is mentioned. Ch. vii. certainly refers back to the previous erection of the Tabernacle, and informs us of the gifts in waggons and oxen, which the princes of the tribes presented at that time. But the application of these could not be introduced until now that the decamping is treated of, and the service of the Levites in connection with it is exactly defined (ch. iv.). Thus the section occupies quite its proper place.

If we review once more the whole section, ch. i.—x., with respect to its entire object and contents, we shall find Eichhorn's judgment to be thoroughly well founded. "On the whole (he says), no intelligible motive can be assigned, that should have induced one in later times to go into these details concerning the conveyance of the Tabernacle and its sacred furniture, had not complete materials for the account been at his hand. After the land was taken possession of, the whole of this part of the service of the Levitical families as good as ceased. The Tabernacle remained permanently where the place of the Sanctuary was; the Ark of the Covenant, it is true, sometimes accompanied the army in the camp, but this was not the case long, when the danger of doing so was experienced, as on one occasion, it fell into the hands of the Philistines. What purpose now could it have served, to invent so circumstantial an account of the services of the Levitical families? Had one even followed tradition in it, would not the information supplied have been merely of a general kind?—would it have gone so deeply into particulars? All the circumstances

1 De Wette, Beitr p. 310.

lead us to conclude that the whole was recorded during the march through the desert." (Einl. 3, p. 292.). With this Bleek also agrees, inasmuch as in Num. i. ii. iv., he discovers evidences of its Mosaic composition in the contents of the information, and recognizes its character as marked by great accuracy and historical fidelity. He adds very properly, that no detailed explanation is necessary to show, "how much such sections serve *to prove the general historical character of the contents of these books.*"[1] Even Bertholdt feels himself here compelled to admit the force of the historical truth (Einl. p. 787.).

Unsuccessful, however, as are the efforts made by the advocates of the mythical explanation to show the necessity of having recourse to it here, they are equally so in their application of it. In ch. x. 29, ff., Hobab is requested by Moses to give them assistance in their march through the desert. Here—exclaims De Wette (p. 343)—we have for once quite a natural narrative; which shows the difference between an historical relation and a mythus. But then immediately after this narrative follows the mention of the cloudy pillar (ver. 34),[2] so that there again we encounter a mythical foundation. To what does this criticism now have recourse? To a "*perhaps.*" "*Perhaps* (it is said) it is only the compiler that has jumbled these heterogeneous things together." It was felt that it would not do to represent an author as in the same breath inventing things that are apparently most fabulous, and then suddenly affording us true historical information. Hence one's readiest shift is to frame a new hypothesis, or rather to have recourse to the old one of a fragmentary compilation. But even a compiler could not have acted so thoughtlessly as to join together what is so heterogeneous, especially he whose only object elsewhere is to "mythologize." Hence that ominous "*perhaps.*" This circumstance, however, will lead us to a different conclusion; namely, that we have here to do with an author who, with the greatest discretion, distinguishes the human and natural from the supernatural and miraculous, and who is firmly convinced that the introduction of the former cannot be prejudicial to his statements where they contain what is of the latter character; whose object consequently is not to relate

[1] Stud. u. Krit. l. c. pp. 508, 509.

[2] That there is no contradiction in that of the preceding, see proved in Rosenmüller, Scholl. ad x. 31.

miracles only for their own sake; and this characteristic of the historical narrative distinguishes it most decidedly from everything like mythical description.

But a still more exact definition has been given of the mythical element in this book: it is represented as bearing in relation to Exodus a different and later mythical character, that of a later mythology which delights in miracles and embellishments, and thus proving itself to be a subsequent addition to Exodus.[1] As the chief proofs of this, ch. xi. and xx, as compared with Ex. xvi. xvii., are adduced. Now, as respects the narrative of the quails, we may be surprised, considering the spirit ascribed to the author, not to find him likewise embellishing the account of the manna which in Ex. xvi. stands associated with it. Besides, it would be difficult to show that that narrative of the manna is less wonderful than what is here given respecting the quails. Farther, there is certainly an important difference between the two narratives; a difference consisting not so much in the mere exaggeration of the miracle as in the entire object of the account, which here is to show the people how little they understand making a wise use of the gracious benefits of God; for the sensual principle that predominates in them, lust, is here displayed, and along with that, at the same time, their unfitness to take possession of the land of promise.[2] The narrative of bringing water out of the rock is still more instructive. In Numbers, the language of the people's murmuring is much stronger, which it must have been, for even Moses and Aaron participate in their unbelief; and the insurrection was much greater. In Exodus Moses prays, and Jehovah answers him, but here Moses and Aaron go before the Tabernacle, &c.,—this, which could not have been done *before* the erection of it, must necessarily have been the case *after* that. In the former passage the performance of the miracle is simply stated, here it is given at much greater length; which likewise is quite necessary, for it is in this particular that the two narratives are most essentially distinguished from each other; as in the one the faith of Moses is displayed, but here his and Aaron's unbelief. Accordingly we find just those particulars of difference that in every case serve to transport us exactly into the dif-

1 De Wette, Beitr. p. 314, ff.

2 The passage xi. 5 affords a striking evidence of the writer's accurate acquaintance with Egypt.

ferent historical condition and circumstances, and which cannot be explained at all by a mere embellishment of previous miracles—if we will make the writer a fictionist, why give him so little credit for invention?—and this is precisely a guarantee of their internal historical truth.

But though according to these views of the critics, the author of this book must have had Exodus before his eyes, yet directly after this assertion, they affirm that there is a contradiction between the two books, namely, in the statement respecting the seventy elders, ch. xi., comp. Ex. xviii., xxiv. 1, 9.[1] This also would then be irreconcilable with the other; but such an intentional contradiction is a thing quite inconceivable. But how stands the case as to the contradiction itself? The elders mentioned in the book of Numbers are by no means a standing magisterial authority. They are selected from the elders of Israel (ver. 24), whose existence in that capacity is consequently presupposed. The call which they received was intended to shew the rebellious people the power of the Lord, who pours out his Spirit upon them in a wonderful manner, and to bring the people back within the limits of order. But their merely temporary appointment is expressly stated (ver. 25);[2] hence we find no farther reference to them in the Scriptures. Thus the history here presents no analogy with later circumstances, and the assertion of its being invented has consequently no sense at all.

Chap. xii. is represented as mythical, and as having for its object the exaltation of Moses, and the description of God's justice in punishing. The only proof given of its being mythical is the miraculous portion of the narrative.[3] The chapter certainly affords confirmation of the dignity of Moses as a divine ambassador. Instead of enquiring whether Moses was really such, whether he was possessed of all the qualifications for that office, the opposite is at once presupposed, and proof thence derived of the mythus. But would the fictionist, who simply aimed at doing honour to Moses, have given such a reason, as is mentioned in ver. 1, for Aaron and Miriam's quarrel with him? Could this have been the case, when the law expressly permitted marriage with foreign

1 De Wette, Beitr. p. 345.

2 The only correct reading here is יִסַּף, according to which also the LXX., the Peshito, and the Arab. translate; comp. Gesenius, De Pent. Sam., p. 41.

3 De Wette, l. c. p. 346.

women, and prohibited it only with the Canaanites? It would be strange then had any one hit upon this idea.

Chaps. xiii. xiv. contain that turning-point in the whole of the history in the Pentateuch, namely, the statement of the cause of the forty years' wandering in the desert. It has been believed[1] that the narrative consists of two disconnected portions:—that xiv. 26—38 is only another version of ver. 11—24. But the former is manifestly an enlarged continuation of what had been expressed; God's first address commands the Israelites to turn back into the wilderness, the second announces to them their abode for forty years in it. That the two are closely connected, is proved by the circumstance, that according to xiv. 6, ff. both Joshua and Caleb endeavour to appease the people, while in ver. 24 it is to Caleb alone that a promise is given, which is not made to them both till ver. 38. But Caleb's being named singly in ver. 24 is explained partly by xiii. 30, because Caleb had spoken first, partly by the speciality of the promise given him. There is as little contradiction between the section and Deut. i. 20, ff., but the two passages mutually explain each other; and Vater (p. 62) even must admit that the account in Deuteronomy presupposes that in Numbers. Thus according to that, the sending out of the spies originates with the people, who prepare the severe temptation for themselves, but Moses does not accede to their request without having obtained God's sanction of the plan: then at his command the spies are despatched. We find, however, in xiii. 22 a particular and not unimportant proof of the Mosaic composition. Not only is the notice respecting the primitive Anakite tribes uncommonly exact, but that also relating to the building of Hebron has much weight. For Zoan (Tanis) is here evidently assumed as the object that was known, and Hebron as that which was unknown; this is suited only to a nation that was coming out of Egypt, and was familiar with its antiquities; and hence the passage in this its peculiar form does not admit of being treated as a native and indigenous tradition.

But if the fact does not admit of being challenged in the above respect, De Wette insists the more strenuously on that which is miraculous and incomprehensible in the account, namely, that Jehovah should announce such a punishment to the people. He calls

1 Vater, iii. p. 70. ff., 455. De Wette, p. 347.

this arbitrary. But here again the unsatisfactoriness of the mythical hypothesis may be very strikingly exposed. The fact of the Israelites wandering in the wilderness for forty years, is confirmed by testimonies from the whole of Scripture; all the chronological statements of the Pentateuch agree with it; and the assertion that the number of the years is a round one has no certain analogy on its side.[1] Now this being firmly established, we are justified in asking, what gave occasion to that long period of sojourning? How came Moses to give up the plan of taking possession of Canaan? De Wette admits the problem, and is aware of the insufficient character of the ordinary solutions of it. "It is hard (he says) to give up the execution of a plan to which one has devoted half a life-time. Such an act of resignation, performed voluntarily, and in addition, arising from a false want of self-confidence, *is not human*." Göthe remarks, that the picture of a man like Moses is quite disfigured, by representing such a person—whose natural character was one of the loftiest aspirations, and distinguished by energy, promptness, and boldness in action—as roving about for forty years, without sense or necessity, with a vast multitude of people in a space too small for them, in sight of his great object. The way in which Göthe tries to solve the problem, we shall leave for future examination; only remarking that nothing can be more arbitrary than to change the forty years into hardly two full years. De Wette has another shift. He remarks the gap in the history, subjoins a significant query—*who knows* what happened in this period? —and thus arrives at the conclusion, that concerning the most important part of the history we know nothing. Thus he has tied his own hands. For whence arises that gap in the history? If what was so remarkable took place in this period, how should no trace of that have been preserved, were it only a perverted tradition? And how was it then that a later age, which otherwise was acquainted with so much, also knew nothing in this place concerning "the most important part of this history?" The case stands precisely thus, that the gap admits of explanation only from the history itself. The only thing that serves to explain it is that so little transpired during that long space of time, that was sufficiently remarkable and important to deserve

1 Comp. Keil, in the Dörptsch. Beitr. z. d. Theol. Wissensch. ii., p. 327, ff.

mention, or of which even a remembrance was preserved. Thus then we are again thrown back on an extraordinary fact, which explains the circumstance in question. The resignation of Moses and the continuance of the people in the wilderness, can be explained only by acts displaying the divine power and glory. Human ingenuity and skill in explanation are in this case thoroughly put to shame. It is the present section *alone* that enables us to cast a glance into the secret of the divine purpose: *God commands* and the faithful servant of God follows, the disobedient people perceive that they can effect nothing without their God; so that it is only this one thing, the will of God in its fixed and righteous purpose, that solves the otherwise inexplicable problem.

The mythical explanation has no firmer support in the narratives, ch. xvi. and xvii., which, on the contrary, contain a striking proof of their high antiquity. For while xvii. 6 ff. is represented to us as being invented to confer honour on the priestly office, we find in ch. xvi. the offence of Korah and his adherents, and their punishment. On that supposition, however, it would certainly be surprising that a fictionist, who wrote in such a hierarchical spirit, should designate no other than a Levite as the chief instigator to such a crime. This circumstance has its difficulty enhanced, when we recollect that the descendants of this very man (Num. xxvi. 11), were one of the most distinguished Levitical families in the time of David,[1] so that it would be unintelligible how even at that period, and still more at a later, it could have come into the mind of any person to attribute such a crime to the ancestor of that family. What evidence do we find there of the hierarchical tendency, which is professedly perceived everywhere else here?[2] This characteristic sustains the credibility of the narrative in the highest degree; and, this admission being made, it must have been written in the Mosaic age.

1 Comp. 1 Chron. vi. 33, ff. ix. 19, xxvi. 1; 2 Chron. xx. 19. On this Calvin makes the excellent remark: "Certe hoc non vulgare fuit misericordiæ specimen non modo eos a clade servare, sed ex radice maledictâ surculos postea excitare, in quibus fulgerent spirituales ejus divitiæ in communem ecclesiæ usum."

2 Gramberg indeed is put in such a dilemma by this, that he will not allow that the later Korahites were descended from this Korah, l. c. i. p. 138. De Wette also has felt this; Beitr. p. 371, he remarks—quite in opposition to xvi. 32—that Num. xxvi. 11 is contradictory of the present passages, and says: "This second account, which is so different, may very likely have been framed from regard to the race of the Korahites, which subsequently became so renowned."

In exact agreement with the character of the sacrificial laws mentioned in Leviticus, is that respecting the red heifer in ch. xix.; a circumstance which, as everything in it points to an abode in the camp, secures to it its well-founded place among the laws of Moses.[1] The contradictions, which as one will have it, are discoverable between ch. xx. 14, ff. and Deut. ii. 9, 29, xxiii. 4, 5, are easily removed. But it is a mistake to suppose that, according to Numbers, the Edomites refused the Israelites a passage through their territory, and according to Deuteronomy, on the contrary, conceded it. In Deut. ii. 4—8 we are told, that the Edomites supplied the Israelites with provisions for *money* (comp. ii. 29), but not that they permitted them to march through their land. On the contrary, the opposite is plainly stated in ii. 8: ונעבר מאת אחינו בני עשו, which agrees exactly with Num. xx. 21: ויט ישראל מעליו. As little does Deut. ii. 29 contradict Num. xxiii. 4, 5; for in the one it is said that the Moabites gave the Israelites provisions for *money* (just as the Edomites did), while the other affirms that they did not come to meet them (לא קדמו) with provisions, presenting these as friendly gifts. Still less foundation is there for alleging a contradiction between Num. xx. 22–29, and Deut. x. 6, which could be made out only in case we had any where more precise information respecting the situation of the place *Moser* mentioned in the latter passage. How easily may the name of *Hor* have been a general name, and the other a special one![2]

Thus, as far as we have gone, we may recognize the entire credibility of the statements of this book, which present no grounds for suspicion as to their Mosaic authorship.

§ 28. CONTINUATION.—NUMBERS XXI.—XXXVI.

In ch. xxi. we find abundant traces of its ancient composition. That the Israelites should call the first place, which they took from the Canaanites, *Hormah* (*proscription*) xxi. 1—4, we may regard as very intelligible. It is worthy of remark that it is the king of Arad

[1] See Bleek, in the Repert. l. c. p. 9.

[2] Compare the attempts of Buxtorf, Anticr. p. 933, sq.; Lilienthal, die gute Sache, etc. vii. p. 650, ff; Buddeus, Hist. Eccl. v. t. i. p. 641, sq., to explain the difficult passage, Deut. x. 6—9.

that is here named as vanquished; but this conquest and the occupation of his territory must have been only partial, for we find Joshua overcoming the king of Arad and Hormah (Josh. xii. 14);[1] at that time, therefore, two kings must have had dominion in this district. Another part of this district, called Zephath, was likewise conquered at a subsequent time, and also named Hormah, Judg. i. 17: perhaps with a reference to that old achievement of Moses. Thus this relation bears an exact reference to the following later ones, and we now also comprehend why the Israelites did not follow up this conquest and try to invade Canaan on this side, which however was connected with other additional difficulties.[2]

The remarkable passage concerning the erection of the brazen serpent, xxi. 5–10, affords equal evidence of its Mosaic origin, especially when compared with 2 Kings xviii. 4. The facts, that Hezekiah destroyed, along with other objects of heathen worship, the brazen serpent, to which the Israelites offered incense, thus making it an object of idolatry, and that the general opinion at that time was that Moses had erected that serpent, supply much in favour of the present passage. Had the serpent been from the very commencement an object of worship in the manner described, Hezekiah could not have destroyed it like heathen practices; but his proceeding is in perfect accordance with the account in the Pentateuch, inasmuch as that makes no mention of an idolatrous worship, but is expressly directed against any such tendency. But neither can this account contain a priestly legend, having for its object to give a fairer colouring to the matter; for since the act of Hezekiah at least must have been well known to those who might frame such a story, they could not possibly mean to countenance the popular notion, but must in that case have represented Moses in the same relation to this matter as to the erection of the golden calf (Ex. xxxii.). But if the proceeding of Hezekiah be explicable on his admission, that he had a firm foundation of established authority for it, and hence must have been acquainted with the account in the Pentateuch, then

1 [The two passages appear to me to refer to the same fact. Yet that there were two kings in the district, a king of Arad and a king of Hormah, is plainly affirmed by the passage in Joshua.—TR.].

2 The right view of Num. xxi. 1–4, was perceived by Clericus ad h. l. Later writers, as Rosenmüller (Alterthumsk. ii. 2, p. 313, ff.), Studer on the Book of Judges, p. 34, ff., incorrectly identify this occurrence with what is related in Judg. i. 16, 17, and then take Num. xxi. 3, 4, to be a later addition (so at least Rosenmüller).

indeed the question arises, how this proceeding on the part of Moses is accordant with Monotheism, and whether the Lawgiver must not manifestly have given encouragement by it to idolatry.[1] But it is expressly from Jehovah that the people expect deliverance, hence it is Jehovah that institutes this symbol, and there is not a single syllable that indicates any kind of identity between the symbol and Jehovah. On the contrary, the symbol has a meaning only when regarded as setting forth the overcoming and defeat of the serpent and its noxious bite. In this way, however, the symbol points expressly to Jehovah as the God who delivers, and is as far as possible from conveying a magical idea, that should attribute to the symbol, as such, a value not belonging to it. Now, if we enquire more narrowly into the historical circumstances of the Israelites at that time, viewed in that relation also the symbol will appear to be quite intelligible and suitable in the sense we have mentioned. The people are in a district that abounds particularly in noxious serpents;[2] these become in the hand of Jehovah a means of punishing the Israelites; the heathen perversion of the truth, which made the serpent itself the symbol of immortality, and the conveyer of healing power, must have been known to the Israelites from an Egyptian quarter;[3] hence there was great propriety, the more so especially as the primitive tradition of the nation was in unison with such a method, in presenting to their view the right aspect of the symbol, and confirming their belief that the same God, who brought that infliction upon them, was alone able to remove and overcome it by his almighty power. Thus, in this light also, we are justified in regarding the history as suited to the Mosaic age.

The following portion informs us of additional events; in connection with which mention is also made of ancient songs, having their origin in that age. The Israelites press on to the Arnon: to this reference is made in a passage in "the book of the wars of Jehovah," which is quoted by the author; it is a geographical notice, obscure indeed, because severed from its connection, but of importance at the time, as stating the ancient boundaries of the Moabitish territory, xxi. 14, 15. But while it is apparent on the face of such a passage that it cannot be invented, it shows

1 Comp. Vatke in particular, Bibl. Theol. i. p. 199, ff.
2 Burckhardt, Reise ii. p. 814.
3 Comp. Creuzer, Symbolik i. p. 526, ff.

at the same time how much concerned the writer is to communicate the truth of history. It shows great inconsiderateness to suppose, that a book bearing such a title could not have existed as yet in the time of Moses, because the wars of the people had then only just commenced.[1] Yet certainly it is not necessary that the book should have come into existence at the very moment these enterprises were undertaken. That the wars of Moses supplied matter enough, to give a book relating to them even in the time of Moses, the name of "the book of the wars of Jehovah," can be denied by none. This section makes it evident, in particular, that Israel at that time had men possessed of poetical talent (משלים, ver. 27), and it may also be supposed that the two other songs, mentioned in this chapter, were to be found in that same collection. Now why should not the collection have been undertaken even in the age of Moses? So likewise do these two other songs—ver. 17, 18, and ver. 27—30—bear the stamp of originality,[2] while at the same time they place the author in a very favourable light, as one possessed of such exact sources of information, and confirm the occurrences with which they stand in connection. For should we assume the occurrences to be invented, but the poems to be genuine, we should give admission to the view, that a later age (whether by oral or written communication) was in possession of distinct information relating to the Mosaic period; in which case the introduction of fiction becomes at least highly improbable; and still less can we consistently imagine an author, who on the one hand gives evidence of so much regard to history, and on other hand gives the rein without restraint to the arbitrary inventions of his fancy. These very songs are a proof that we are not here in the domain of fiction.

Ch. xxii.—xxiv. Balaam's history and prophecies also confirm us in the conclusion to which our researches thus far have led us. In a critical respect, the first question that presents itself here is, whether this portion forms a separate fragment, having an independent existence.[3] But the proofs in support of that opinion are unsatisfactory. The divine names *Elohim* and *Jehovah* are not employed *by turns* in the prophecies, as Vater will have it, similarly

1 Vater, 3, p. 645.

2 See Bleek, in Repert. 1. c. p. 3—6. De Wette, Einl. p. 191. On the other hand we have wholly erroneous opinions *e. g.* in Fulda, l. c. p. 201, ff.

3 This is maintained by Vater, 3, p. 118, ff. De Wette, p. 362, ff.

to what they are in Genesis: it is only the name *Jehovah* that is found in them, and once that of *Elohim*, but with the pronoun, xxiii. 21. We are next called to observe the contradiction between the present narrative, and xxxi. 8, 16. In the one passage it is said, that Balaam was slain by the Israelites; which can be no contradiction of this section, as it was an event of subsequent occurrence, and there is nothing against the supposition that Balaam afterwards returned back from his native country (xxiv. 25) to the Midianites, with whom he must at any rate have maintained a connection. This passage rather presupposes that Balaam has been previously a subject of discourse; otherwise it could not introduce the mention of his death in that manner. The second passage informs us that Balaam counselled the Midianites to seduce the Israelites to idolatry.* But this likewise presupposes the contents of this section. Balaam must have received an impression of the power of Jehovah; he must have attained the conviction that the only means of overcoming Israel was to induce them to abandon their God (comp. Deut. xxiii. 5, 6.). It is true that this section has much that is poetical in its representation, and that even the historical account itself takes a higher flight, such as we do not find elsewhere in this book. But this circumstance also is sufficiently explained by the matter, and by the subject, which is truly poetical in its nature, while the oracles that are interspersed must have led still more to such a mode of representation.[1] The author is carried away, as it were, by his subject, he lives in it, and depicts the wonderful occurrence with powerful and elevated animation. We cannot think but that such a circumstance is highly favourable to the view that the writer was a contemporary. Were we, however, to insist on much that is peculiar in the language of the section, the supposition would still be left us, that our author found it already recorded in writing, perhaps in the book of the wars of Jehovah, mentioned in ch. xxi., and then embodied it in his own work in a revised form (comp. xxii. 1, ff.). That book may very well have contained original compositions like the oracles, especially when we find it probable that the two other songs in ch. xxi. were extant in it.

A second critical point of view respecting this section, is the

1 Comp., besides, the author's General Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 97, ff., of the German original.

question as to its historical or mythical character. The ordinary reasons advanced against its historical truth are of little weight;[1] they rest partly on a misunderstanding of its contents, partly on doctrinal prejudice.[2] The whole weight of the argument here centres in the view taken of the oracles of Balaam. These form the foundation and substance of the whole history; if they are fictitious, we are no longer at liberty to decide respecting the history what in it is true, and what is not so: we must then give it up altogether, as having no internal support or substance. This has also been fully recognized by recent critics, and therefore the discourses of Balaam have received special attention from them. It has also been agreed upon respecting them that the form in which they appear is not their original one, and their fictitious character is said to be evidenced by the definiteness of the predictions representing the details of future events.[3] For the view that pronounces a portion of these prophecies to be interpolated, viz., ch. xxiv. 14—24,[4] is in the first place an unsatisfactory one, since it does not recognize the remaining portion to be immediate prophecies of Balaam's; and again, from its arbitrary character it is self-destructive; but at bottom it is identical with the first-mentioned view, as it refuses to regard these oracles as original productions. Let us now proceed on the admission of the unity of the oracles, and enquire whether the data here predicted admit of being reconciled with a distinct hypothesis of the fictitious nature of the prophecy. The first expressions, which have a more general form, represent Israel as being blessed of God, and as dwelling by themselves among the nations; the seer beholds the tents of Jacob—the people has been led out of Egypt, and has marched through the wilderness, and will now display its might as a conquering band (xxiii. 7—10, 18—24, xxiv.5.). All these traits are suited only to a prophecy of the Mosaic age. Then the nations, which are introduced by the seer into the foreground of his prophecy, are the Amalekites, Edomites, Moabites and Kenites, and this too we must admit to be in accordance with the

1 Comp. *e. g.* Bauer's Hebr. Mythol. i. p. 306, ff. Hartmann, p. 496, ff.

2 Comp. the treatises of Steudel, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1831, H. ii. Liter. Anzeiger v. Tholuck, 1832, Nr. 78, ff.

3 So De Wette, Beitr. p. 364, ff. Bleek, in the Repert, l. c.p 34, ff. Gesenius, De Pent. Sam. p. 6. Von Bohlen, p. cxxxv., &c.

4 Bertholdt, Einl. 3, p. 792, ff.

assigned age; the omission of the Philistines, when contact with those nations is prominently referred to, being of special importance. But then, with respect to Amalek there is the special statement, that the king of Israel should be greater than Agag, (xxiv. 7),—that Amalek should perish (xxiv. 20); and of Edom it is said that Israel should take possession of it. This statement is accordingly referred, as to its date, to the time of Saul, who conquered king Agag. Now, should we give this prophecy so special an application, even then, supposing it was recorded *post eventum*, the contrast it presents to the preceding at once excites surprise, as that shows an exact regard to the age and circumstances of Moses. But it is also clear, that this hypothesis does not suit the case; for Saul by no means effected the complete destruction of the Amalekites. Edom also was not taken possession of by that king, but first of all by David (2 Sam. viii. 14.). Thus it must have been under David that the prophecy was composed; but in that case we cannot see how Saul's dominion, whose race was rejected, could receive the notice it is here said to have; for Bleek correctly remarks, p. 36: "it could not have been written subsequently to Saul's time, since no one would have thought (in another age) of giving such a description of the greatness of the Israelitish king, or of making special mention of Agag. Thus then the prophecy, so far considered, and regarded as written *post eventum*, is completely inexplicable. But it becomes still more so, when we look at what follows. There Asshur is named, and that too as carrying the Kenites into captivity (xxiv. 22.). If by Asshur we are to understand Assyria or Babylonia, either of these kingdoms, in their victorious supremacy, could no more be known and mentioned by a seer of the age of Saul or David, through his own unaided ability and foresight, than by one of the Mosaic age. We might rather ask, whether we should not sooner expect a knowledge of Asshur from Balaam, a native of Mesopotamia, than from an Israelite living in the reigns just mentioned. But how is the particular prominence that is here given to the Kenites, to be explained at all? Modern criticism finds it necessary to *separate* these verses from the preceding, and to assign them to a later age; which brings us to nothing else than Bertholdt's arbitrary method. But he who cannot help himself here without the supposition of interpolation, voluntarily gives up his cause. But this criticism is involved in still

greater difficulties by the expression respecting Asshur, that the Kittæans (Chittim) should humble Asshur and Eber, and that Eber also should be destroyed (xxiv. 24.). Now here again it is evidently insufficient to suppose a poet of the Assyrian period as the author. For if we should understand the appellation of Kittæans, of the islands and countries of the west in general, in which sense the name occurs also in Jerem. ii. 10, Ezek. xxvii. 6, or in a more restricted sense, of a particular nation of the continent; let it be considered, how impossible it is to fix this prophecy as one written *post eventum*. It is a supposition unavoidably necessary, that the fulfilment of the prophecy can belong only to the Macedonian age; for supposing it were, as Bleek will have it, that the humiliation of Asshur were but a general prediction, what then becomes of the humiliation of *Eber?* But above all how comes it, that the *destruction* of Eber is here predicted? Is that to be referred to the period of the Exile? The prophets, however, unanimously announced the return from the exile: how then have we such an exception here? Thus we see that this prediction has a still more remote reference, which brings us only to the highest point of the proof, that it cannot possibly have been written after the event. This view has also by no means been shown to be untenable, but has only gained additional confirmation from the latest attempt[1] to refer the prophecy respecting the Kittæans to the irruption of the Greeks into Cilicia, about B.C. 710.[2] For, admitting that the Hebrews were acquainted with that occurrence; admitting that there is an agreement between this fictitious prediction, and the allusions in Micah (vi. 5) and Amos (vi. 1), it is still to be observed,—1. That Asshur was by no means humbled by that invasion, but after great loss was successful in vanquishing the enemy, and Sanherib (Sennacherib) celebrated his bravery and warlike prowess by several victorious trophies; consequently it was a fresh triumph of the Assyrian power.[3] 2. Eber and Asshur were to be humbled by the Kittæans; but where do we find the slightest trace of Palestine being affected, or even so much as threatened, by that invasion?

1 Comp. Hitzig. Begr. d. Kritik, p. 54, ff.

2 Comp. Berosus in Euseb. Chron. Arm. i. p. 42, 43, ed. Ancher. Gesenius on Isaiah, i. p. 999, ff.

3 V. Bohlen, *ibid.*, indeed represents the Assyrians as having been *driven back*, of which there is nothing in the place referred to!

Hitzig indeed thinks that the Hebrews had felt afraid, and that the fear had perhaps begun to realize itself; but this is a mere fanciful notion; and how could this oracle be then expressed as it is? and what then becomes of its being written after the event? Consider in addition, 3, that the passage, Dan. xi. 30, ובאו בו ציים כתים, decidedly refers to the present passage, and indicates the fulfilment of that more general prediction, according to which nations of the West were to make an end of Asshur (which is also used here in the more extended sense of—"powers of the East"); being the application of it to a special case, which falls under this general category. Thus at the time of the Exile this prediction was regarded as being still unfulfilled, and as receiving its accomplishment from the Grecian period onwards. The same is also evident from Jeremiah, who likewise refers to the present prediction (xlviii. 45.). Consequently the prophecy will gain an intelligible character, just as it is referred in a wider sense to the far remote periods of Grecian and Roman dominion.

But even as the prediction becomes unintelligible in that part of it, unless it is regarded as genuine prophecy, and its origin consequently admitted to be authentic, so is it also with the historical portion of this and the following sections. There is such a vividness in the narrative contained in the history of Balaam, and such an exact representation of the localities, that, when viewed even in that respect, it cannot be regarded as invention. In addition to this, there are individual historical notices, which could hardly have been preserved by a later age; such as particularly, that the Moabites and Midianites were then in close alliance, which is plain also from ch. xxv., where the Moabites are spoken of ver. 1, ff., and in ver. 6, ff. a Midianitess, while xxxi. 16, 17, the same thing is said of the Midianites, as is here said of the Moabites.[1] Thus it is clear that this part was written with the immediate impression and distinct view of the time, as present to the mind: in such a case fiction is quite impossible. We have, besides, such particulars as the narrative of the act of Phinehas, xxv. 7, ff., and the statement of the genealogy of the man and the woman, whom he slew (xxv. 14, ff.). We have already remarked, in § 27, on the congruity in the relation of the census or numbering in ch. xxvi., to that which occurs in ch. i., ff. We would only add, that, as the difference in the sums

1 Consequently, De Wette's remarks, Beitr. p. 369, ff., are incorrect.

total is found to be quite suitable ("ratio inter natos et mortuos, omnibus probe ponderatis, bene convenit calculis recentioribus, Süssmilchianis imprimis." Rosenm. ad xxvi. 51), so it might be expected, that, when we come to particulars, the difference in the case of each tribe would be much greater, which would then be equalized only in the entire sum. And this is decidedly the case, as *e. g.* the number of the tribe of Reuben had decreased to the amount of 2770 men, while that of Judah, on the contrary, had increased about 1900.

The case of which we read in xxvii. 1, ff., namely the legal claim of the daughters of Zelophehad, is regarded by De Wette himself at "tradition"—so that here for once the pure mythical position is abandoned—and he thus explains it: "It may be a jurist [professor of laws] that has taken up and treated this case, which is one of great importance in public law, as we have it here, with the laws that follow from it (vers. 1—11.)" But who can this jurist have been? The passage is by no means an isolated one: it is closely connected with the preceding; comp. xxvi. 33, ch. xvi. (xxvii. 3.). The same writer must consequently have been the author of the rest as well; and then it will not agree very well, that the same writer should have treated the one case as a pure myth, and the other with such juridical accuracy. Thus the whole hypothesis is one that is entirely arbitrary; a bare assertion, made simply to avoid yielding the admission, which presses itself powerfully upon him, that we stand here on purely historical ground.

The observations in opposition to the mention of the appointment of Joshua as the successor of Moses (xxvii. 11—23) are no better.[1] The chief argument here is, that we meet with different accounts in the Pentateuch respecting the preparation made by Moses for his decease. The difference as to time, which is said to exist in reference to that matter between the statements in Numbers and in Deuteronomy, is particularly urged. But in this the passage Num. xxxi. 2 is overlooked, in which it is expressly said that, not till after the victory over the Midianites, should Moses be gathered to his fathers. But that this had been already announced earlier to Moses, is evident from Deut. iii. 23, ff., especially v. 28. The repetition of this divine command in Deut. xxxii. 48, ff., arises from the nature of the case, since the former instance was but the pre-

1 Beitr. p. 372. Comp. Vater, p. 166.

paration for the hour of death, which in the latter has actually arrived.[1]

De Wette also regards the account of the campaign against the Midianites in ch. xxxi. as being suspicious. "According to the representation here given, the whole Midianitish nation appears to have been annihilated; yet we find the Midianites again in Judges vii. as a powerful people, from whom the Israelites suffered oppression" (Beitr. p. 374.). To suppose that the whole Midianitish nation was extirpated, is a strange idea in itself, considering the mode of life of such entirely nomadic tribes. But it is expressly remarked that they were divided into single tribes, governed by separate princes, and that only five of these were destroyed.[2] It follows also from the small numbers of Israelites who marched to the war, as well as the small number of the captives taken,[3] that it could not possibly have been the whole Midianitish nation, that this expedition was directed against. On the contrary, it was only those tribes that lay in the neighbourhood of the Israelites, and that had sought to seduce them to idolatry, (xxv. 16, xxxi. 2.). It cannot be precisely shown from history how powerful the Midianites afterwards again became. For in Judg. vi. 3, they appear united with the Amalekites and other nomadic hordes, which made irruptions into Palestine, and excited consternation by their predatory expeditions. No one, therefore, upon an unprejudiced examination, can discover a contradiction here. "It is also surprising that in ch. xxxii. Moses, in dividing the conquests on this side Jordan, makes no assignment of the country of the Midianites." This difficulty also is easily removed by what has been already remarked. The war with the Midianites had no other object than that of taking vengeance on them for the wickedness they had practised on Israel: its aim was not conquest, that being restricted in general to the Canaanitish nations. Hence it was only the district of Sihon and Og that was divided (xxxii. 33); in connection with

[1] The names of the mountains Abarim, Pisgah, Nebo, are thus related to one another: Abarim is the name of the entire chain, of which Pisgah is a particular mountain, and the highest peak of that was named Nebo. Comp. especially Deut. xxxii. 49, Num. xxxiii. 47.

[2] See Num. xxxi. 8, Josh. xiii. 21, from which passages it is clear that these princes were vassals of Sihon. See Maurer in loc.

[3] Comp. xxxi. 5, and Rosenmüller upon it; xxxi. 40.

which the supposition might indeed be made, that the territory of the former included that of the Midianites, which however is not probable for the reason just stated. "The hierarchical reference appears in the division of the spoil: perhaps it is only on that account that the narrative has been given." But it necessarily follows from the whole nature of the war, that, on this occasion more than on any, a part of the spoil must be reserved for Jehovah. The objection itself, however, rests upon the groundless supposition of the gradual development at a later period of the rights of the priesthood. "In ver. 49 we have a remark that is worthy of the whole narrative, and confirms its character, namely, that in the campaign against the Midianites, who are said to have suffered a complete defeat, the Israelites did not lose so much as a single man." Similar instances, however, are not uncommon in history;[1] the particulars of the expedition itself are not stated; and, in the fact referred to, the Israelites themselves recognise a special act of the divine favour. This was shown to be particularly effectual on the present occasion, when the matter in question was the magnifying of Jehovah in opposition to idolatry: the issue of the conflict, in accordance with the promises of the Lord, was a complete victory, which was due to Jehovah alone.

In ch. xxxii. a very full narrative is given of the division of the Trans-Jordanic territory. While this prolixity in the account is evidence of a feeling of interest which was founded only in the circumstances of that age, and could not be excited at a time when all were in quiet possession of their own territories, so as to lead to the invention of accounts of this kind—as to which any arbitrary hypothesis will only involve itself in so much the more contradiction; this holds good especially of the circumstance, to which most prominence is here manifestly given, that the inhabitants of the apportioned territory were required to give their aid to the rest of the tribes in the conquest of their inheritance. Should we conceive of the narrative as being invented, this form could have been given

1 Rosenmüller on xxxi. 49 adduces two instances from Tacitus, Annal. 13, 39, and Strabo xvi., p. 1128. Geddes remarks, that the Midianites must have been taken by surprise, and must have been effeminate. The above argument is as weak in a critical respect, as if one were to dispute the genuineness of the life of Saladin, because it contains almost in the same words a like statement respecting the issue of a battle; comp. p. 127. ولم يفقد من المسلمين احد في ذلك اليوم

to it only in the age immediately succeeding: no other age would have felt such a command of Moses to be of consequence: but in that age least of all is one at liberty, or disposed, to seek for the origin of such fictions. But it is said that the narrative also represents such times as are far removed from accredited history. "The cities which are enumerated in vers. 34–38, as built by the Gadites and Reubenites, were certainly not built at that time, but subsequently at different dates."[1] From ver. 3 it is quite clear, that the greater part of these cities were in existence previously, and hence the ויבנו in ver. 34, must be understood of a rebuilding and restoration of the cities. This is also quite evident from the fact that the new inhabitants changed the old names of the cities (ver. 38.). But the account concerning the villages of Jair (vers. 41, 42), has been especially regarded as an occurrence that did not take place till a later period (Judg. x. 4), and therefore its being transferred to the Mosaic age is adduced as a mark of the non-authenticity and arbitrariness of our informant.[2] It is only a make-shift to have recourse here to the supposition of an interpolation, which some have believed themselves obliged to adopt,[3] especially as we should then have to regard Deut. iii. 14 also as interpolated, in order to be consistent. But the correctness of the statements in the Pentateuch admits here of as complete proof as is possible. Jair was descended on the mother's side from Manasseh, on the father's side from Judah. Segub, Jair's father, was a son of Hezron, the father of Caleb, and of a daughter of Machir, the son of Manasseh; comp. 1 Chron. ii. 21, 22; Judg. i. 12. Segub was thus a contemporary of Moses, and died in the wilderness; so that Moses could transfer the inheritance which he conquered only to his son Jair. It is said, indeed, that Moses gave it to Machir (ver. 40); but ver. 39, where the *sons* of Machir are spoken of, shows that the name is here employed only as a collective appellation. At the same time, however, the appellation has also a special reference to what follows. It supplies the reason why Jair could have his inheritance in the Trans-Jordanic territory. It was through Machir that he was descended on the mother's side from

[1] De Wette, Beitr. p. 376.

[2] Vater, 3, p. 635, ff. De Wette, p. 376. Winer, Real-WB. i. p. 629. Studer on Judges, p. 267, ff., &c.

[3] Comp. Clericus, de script. Pent. § 17. Faber, Archäol. d. Hebr. i. p. 160. Jahn, Einl. ii. p. 63, &c.

Manasseh. That Jair was a contemporary of Moses appears also from Num. xxvi. 29, ff., where the male line of Machir is given; according to which, Zelophehad also must have stood in the same relation as Segub, as a contemporary of Moses. This then being established, the question arises, what does the Pentateuch represent Jair to have received as his possession? According to Numbers, the sons of Machir took possession of Gilead, that is, that part of Gilead which fell to Manasseh. Of Jair it is only said that he "took the small towns" (חַוֹּת) of the Amorites, which were called Jair's towns.[1] This required a more precise definition, which we find in Deut. iii. 13, 14. In this last passage also it is said that Machir, that is, his descendants, received possession of Gilead. But Jair's possession is stated with more exactness, as situated not in Gilead, but in Bashan, and as consisting of the whole district of Argob, which was Havoth-Jair. Now, Argob lay in the north of the East-Jordanic district, at the sources of the Jordan, as far as the boundary of the Geshurites and Maachathites, as it is said even to the foot of Hermon. Argob, which means "stone-heaps' or "stony-land," may have received its name from the basaltic formations, which are found in the whole of Hauran, and which are among the most remarkable characteristics of this East-Jordanic district.[2] The only question that can arise is, whether Argob included the western half of Hauran, Gaulanitis (Golan), now Dsholan, or the eastern half, Trachonitis, now Ledsha? But the boundary mentioned in the place referred to, namely, the territory of the Geshurites and Maachathites, decides for the former district.[3] Maachath lay, according to Hieronymus, at the foot of Hermon, indeed at the sources of the Jordan, and therefore on the western side. The Old Testament also is in favour of this view; comp. Josh. xiii. 11.

With the passage in Deuteronomy, as thus explained, the statements of the book of Joshua are in full agreement. They state that the sons of Machir received the half of Gilead, with Ashtaroth and Edrei (xiii. 31); that the towns of Jair lay in Bashan, and con-

1 Studer, l. c. therefore, incorrectly concludes from the passage, that the villages of Jair here mentioned were transferred to Gilead. That this is not done either in 1 Kings iv. 13, and 1 Chron. ii. 22, as the same writer supposes, we shall see farther on.

2 Comp. Ritter, Erdk. ii. p. 354, ff. Von Raumer, Palæstina, p. 62.

3 Studer, l. c., therefore is incorrect. Von Raumer, l. c. p. 157, is correct; and in the Liter. Anz. by Tholuck, 1834, Num. 1, 2.

sisted of sixty cities (xiii. 30, comp. Deut. iii. 4.). The boundary also is here described in the same manner, and the remark is made that the Geshurites and Maachathites were not driven out, but "dwell among the Israelites until this day" (xiii. 11—13.).—If we now go to the ancient genealogical register of the First book of Chronicles, in which many historical notices are preserved, it is there said that Jair, Segub's son, lost thirty cities to the Geshurites and Aramæans[1] (1 Chron. ii. 23.). From what has been previously remarked respecting the situation of Argob, it is clear that this must have been the same district, and the information already adduced concerning the Geshurites only confirms this notice. This is indicated also by the circumstance, that one of these cities was Kenath, in the Pentateuch called Nobach (Num. xxxii. 43), situated on the northern boundary of Dsholan, where Burckhardt found the most considerable village in Dsholan, under the name of Nowa, with important ruins.[2] But the chronicler also speaks of twenty-three cities besides, which Jair the son of Segub possessed. But these cannot be identical with the former; for it is expressly said of them, that they were situated in the land of Gilead (1 Chron. ii. 22.). Gilead, however, must here necessarily be taken in a more restricted sense, since the whole of Gilead certainly did not belong to the tribe of Manasseh, but only the northern portion of it, which is here spoken of.[3] How Jair came to have this possession we know not; but probably it was in the way of conquest, since it was here also that his relatives, the descendants of Machir, possessed their inheritance, with whom he may have allied himself. Of these twenty-three cities the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua make no mention. On the other hand, we have an account in the book of Judges x. 4 respecting the Gileadite Jair, the judge of Israel, x. 3, 4. "He had thirty sons, and thirty cities, which

1 [The author appears here to have committed a mistake, which I hardly know how to unravel. The passage in the Hebrew, however, is somewhat ambiguous and difficult. —Tr.]

2 I. p. 443. Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. p. 97, assigns this place to the district of Dshedur, the former habitation of the Geshurites. Modern writers, therefore, as Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. ii. 1, p. 283; Gesenius on Burckhardt; Reis, 1, p. 505; Winer, Reallex. 1, p. 772, are wrong in taking this place to be identical with Kanuat, which Burckhardt found not far from Sueida.

3 Studer, l. c., therefore makes a wrong application here of the distinctions between Gilead, in its narrower and wider meaning, in understanding the latter to be intended here.

are called *Jair's towns* [Havoth-Jair] unto this day, which are in the land of Gilead." From this notice it is plain: *a.* that the district of this Jair in Gilead is by no means identical with Argob, which lay in Bashan. *b.* From a comparison of the account in Chronicles, however, we see that this district had increased by seven cities. Thus the statement in the book of Judges, which otherwise is somewhat puzzling, now becomes quite clear and intelligible. It appears that a younger descendant of the older Jair increased the inheritance of twenty-three cities by the addition of seven, and that these on that account received the name of Jair's towns. This was the more suitable, as thirty of the other Jair's towns had fallen into the hands of the enemy. With this result now, 1 Kings iv. 13 is also in complete agreement. In the age of Solomon Ben Geber possessed the towns of Jair in Gilead (חות יאיר בן־מנשה אשר בגלעד), and besides them, the district of Argob in Bashan, sixty great fortified cities. From this account it follows, that in the age of Solomon the territory which had been conquered by the Geshurites had again become the possession of the Israelites; an account, which in itself lays claim to the character of the highest credibility. Consequently it only requires a closer examination to remove the difficulty in the statement of the Pentateuch, and at the same time to support in the strongest manner the authenticity of its historical accounts.

The list of the encampments in ch. xxxiii. now claims our attention as a very exact document. We must first examine what was the author's object in giving it. On the one hand it appears not to name all the places that we have previously found mentioned, while, on the other hand, it contains very many more. This fact is most suitably explained by supposing that the catalogue was intended to present a review of the whole route of the journey, and hence to contain the names of individual places only so far as they were those where the Israelites had remained a considerable time;[1] so that it must as a whole be fuller, while it is also more brief in particular details. That the author intended to give such general statements, is evidently clear from ver. 47, comp. Num. xxi. 12, ff.:

[1] This appears also from the words in ver. 2, מוצאיהם למסעיהם. "Nam non omnia, in quibus substiterunt aliquamdiu Israelitæ, loca Moses hic notat, sed ea duntaxat, in quibus diutius castra habuerunt, ut cibum caperent aut requiescerent." Rosenm. Scholl. ad. h. l.

that only those places which had really been stations for some length of time to the Israelites, are named, is clear from the omission of Tabeerah (Num. xi. 3.).

It is evident at least, from such being its character, that this catalogue does not profess to be a compilation, composed with anxious care, but an independent document, composed for a particular object. In the same way the contradictions of other statements, which it has been said to contain, admit of being easily removed. Take, for instance, the most important of them all, that between xxxiii. 30, 31, and Deut. x. 6; according to which latter passage, the Israelites journeyed from Bene Jaakan to Moserah, while in Numbers, on the contrary, it is from Moseroth to Bene Jaakan. Here it may be the case that one part of the camp occupied the one place, and another the other at the same time; but the difference may also be occasioned by a more enlarged and a more restricted use of those names (which may be indicated by the very fact of the interchange of the singular and plural terminations); but while we cannot come to a demonstrative decision on the point, it is certain that an author, who merely dealt in free invention,[1] would not by any possibility have here admitted such manifest discrepancies with the other portions. Here assuredly discrepancy could only be decidedly injurious: there was at least no room here to explain it as arising from an arbitrary sport of the fancy. There are in addition the brief historical notices which are inserted (vers. 4, 9, 14, 38); "singularities," as De Wette calls them, which are certainly hard to be understood on the mode of explanation adopted by him. The author evidently intends by these, partly, to remind us of individual facts previously mentioned of a particularly remarkable character; partly, to supply an appendix to the previous historical narrative (so in ver. 4.). The agreement of verse 40 with xxi. 1, is remarkable; and is a circumstance which admits of sufficient explanation, only by supposing that we have here to do with a contemporary writer, who, still full of the occurrences of his own time, could not refrain from stating them, and felt himself prompted to point out at least their remarkable nature. That this statement of names and things could not proceed from a later author than Moses, almost all critics have felt

[1] De Wette, Beitr. p. 377, ff. Göthe, Westöstl. Divan, p. 488, ff. Von Bohlen, p. 65, ff.

themselves pressed to recognise as the truth. Even De Wette finds himself compelled to call in the aid of tradition, which, however, does not account for the partially great agreement that appears with the other portions. No one, however, has yet succeeded in evidencing here, even with a show of probability, the pretended revision of the old Mosaic tradition. To this we must add, that no occasion can be stated that should have led a later author to invent such a fiction. It is supposed, indeed, that he wished to supply an authentication of the truth of the tradition concerning the forty years' residence in the wilderness; and that for that purpose he invented the catalogue of stations. But does this object any where manifestly appear, and in such a way that the character of the register at once betrays it? In that case, more precise chronological statements at least could certainly not be wanting; and then, least of all, would any places have been omitted,—the endeavour would have been to multiply them.[1] Even Bertholdt came to a very true decision here, as follows. "The list of the journeying-stations (Num. xxxiii.) is not only given us as the written composition of Moses himself, by the declaration it contains at the commencement, but even without that we should be obliged to believe it to be so. Such catalogues of the journeying-stations of armies on their march were the custom of old among the ancient Oriental nations, and are so even to this day. To suppose that this was recorded from tradition is inadmissible, as well as in the case of the lengthy genealogical tables, and the lists of the numbering of the people; while to regard it as a later invention is absurd, since an occasion for it may indeed perhaps be imagined, but certainly not a reasonable object. We should then be obliged to attribute to the inventor the highest degree of cunning contrivance, of geographical ability, and skill in historical calculation; since, by avoiding all round numbers (the common mark of invention in such literary attempts), by paying regard to the most exact delineation of local peculiarities, and by maintaining such a relation in his numerical statements, as is correctly adjusted to the later dates of fully authenticated history, he has contrived to remove every suspicion of spuriousness from his imposition. *But that is in truth demanding more than is involved in*

[1] Comp. also Rosenmüller's Alterthumsk. 3, p. 137, ff.

requiring that we should regard these documents as Mosaic." (Einl. 3, p. 788.).

The following chapters (xxxiv.—xxxvi.) refer collectively to the division of the land. Here again we can only repeat the remarks already made, that this section could have that special interest, which alone would account for its origin, only at the time that the occupation of the land was in question.[1] Here also ch. xxxv. has been assailed in particular as being written with a Levitical feeling, the refutation of which is also supplied by our previous remarks respecting the Levites. Some pretended contradictions, however, of subsequent statements are charged on this portion.[2] This passage speaks of three cities of refuge beyond Jordan, and three on this side; an appointment which is said to contradict Deut. iv. 41, ff.; Josh. xx. But, in Numbers, Moses gives the general appointment with reference to the cities of refuge; in Deuteronomy he appoints the three beyond Jordan, while the others naturally receive their appointment afterwards from Joshua. In Deut. xix. we read the ordinance referring to the three cities of refuge that were to be fixed upon in Canaan proper, with some special appointments. In all this, therefore, we can discover nothing but the most complete agreement: the existence of contradictions cannot be admitted at all.[3]

§ 29. CONTINUATION. CRITICISM OF DEUTERONOMY.

De Wette's judgment respecting this book is, that it may be proved "to rest entirely on fiction, and indeed so much so that, while the preceding books amidst myths contained traditional data, here tradition does not appear in a single instance to have supplied any materials." The reason given for this truly monstrous assertion is principally a general one.[4] The collector of the fourth book, it is supposed, intended to conclude his collection, embracing in it the whole of the last enactments of Moses (xxxvi. 13), and at the same time to bring the history of Moses also to its close (xxvii.

1 [By "the *occupation* (die Besitznahme) of the land," here and elsewhere, "*the taking possession* of the land" is to be understood.—TR.]

2 De Wette, Beitr. p. 383, ff.

3 Consequently, there appears no need either for the arbitrary notion of Herbst, l. cit. p. 18, sq.

4 Comp. Beitr. ii., p. 385, ff., i. p. 268, ff. Einl. § 157.

12—23.). This view contains as much truth as falsehood. The history of the preceding book, in the last point which it reaches, contains the preparation of Moses for his decease: mention however is not yet made by any means of his departure from the people, and the history of his death is wanting, which alone, when subjoined as an historical appendix to the foregoing, forms the complete close of the entire life of Moses. No one can be of opinion, on closer inspection, that the fourth book bears the character of historical completeness, furnishing a complete conclusion of the Mosaic period.[1] And this receives the clearest confirmation from the close of the book. That close asserts nothing more than that the author has completely recorded the commandments and statutes (המצות והמשפטים), which were published by Moses in the plains of Moab on the east side of Jordan. On the other hand, the fifth book professes as distinctly to have for its object, the communication of the discourses (דברים), which were delivered to the people by Moses in the locality just mentioned. Both statements accordingly may be reconciled with one another; and the only thing to be asked is, whether the distinction thus stated actually appears in this form in the two books? The designation of the distinction, of itself, supposes in our author a general impression [consciousness] of it: but whether the name is only a name, and whether the distinction is actually carried out, requires a closer examination.

When Deuteronomy is brought under our notice as a series of discourses, and indeed of farewell discourses, from the Lawgiver to his nation, the first expectation which such a designation justifies us in forming is, that we should find in it a particular prominence given to the personal views and feelings [the subjectivity] of the speaker, so that by this it will be distinguished from the strictly objective form of the law, which he has hitherto been engaged in promulgating. Now that the present book is marked by this subjective mode of presentation as its prominent characteristic, has in general been recognised and expressed by critics, though in different ways, and not always in a clear and definite form.[2] In Deuter-

1 As is recognized also by Bleek, in the Repert. l. c. p. 46, who however deduces incorrect conclusions from the fact.

2 Comp. *e.g.*, Jahn, Einl. *ii.*, p. 15. Vater, *iii.* p. 622 ("but the warmth of delivery,' which has just been sketched, distinguishes it remarkably.") George, l. c. p. 18, ff.

onomy there is a preponderating prevalence of the parænetic element: instead of the rigorous objective command, we find here the most impressive exhortation; instead of the letter, with its legal obligation, adverse to all development, which finds in itself the ground of its higher necessity, reflection upon the law here prevails, and even the latter is in this way brought home more to the heart. The book has so much of a prophetical colouring; what we previously saw brought forward at the close of Leviticus in the germ, has here attained greater compass and decided importance. The book is a model of prophetic discourse, and from its nature in this respect we may explain, how a later prophetism especially (Jeremiah and Ezekiel) connected itself in particular with this model. This character of the composition is what the author also is fully conscious of. Moses himself here appears as a prophet (נביא xviii. 15, ff.), and the prophetic body which succeeded him is regarded as simply carrying on his work, as an institution standing in intimate connection with it.

Thus we have in this book the monument of a certain propheticoparænetic activity [*i. e.* of certain prophetic labours of a hortatory kind.]. This, however, requires a more exact definition. The representation here is a fruit produced on the soil of the Law; it is the result of that Law which had been exhibited to the people, apprehended in its subjective importance. Hence it follows that it has not only an external connection with the previous legislative appointments, and a reference to these; but the supposition on which it rests, has also at the same time a more profound internal confirmation of a general kind. As all prophecy has its root in the Law, and takes its point of departure from it, so also does this. The Law—the objective divine act, comes first: Prophecy—which is the subjective reflection of the Law, the application of it in its importance to the life of the individual as well as the life of the nation, to the present as well as to the future—and consequently Deuteronomy also, comes afterwards.[1] But along with this also we must not overlook the peculiar character of the prophecy in this book, so as to learn from it that Moses in his higher prophetic dignity, even as in his relations elsewhere, designates himself as standing in special communion with the Deity. Moses is at the same

1 Comp. Bauer, in the Journal (*Zeitschrift*) that has been cited, i. p. 149, ff.

time both Lawgiver and Prophet. As Mediator of the New Covenant, he stands at the head of all theocratic prophecy: hence the peculiarity of his prophetic agency is this, that it not only treats of the Law itself in its subjective application,[1] but carries it out farther, developes, and completes it. Hence there is found in his case such an interpenetration of the legal and the prophetical elements, as we find nowhere else. But this mutual interpenetration is so intimate, that the prophetic element itself has received at least partially a legal colouring, and the legal element a prophetical colouring. From this relation of the legal to the prophetical in Deuteronomy, there follows accordingly, on the one hand, the later composition of the book as compared with the other books of the Pentateuch; and on the other hand, the right of Moses to be considered the author of it.

Criticism, however, has not been led by recognizing the difference "in its whole spirit and character," which marks the present book as compared with the preceding, to give a deeper consideration to this difference and its explanation, so as to refer the individual phenomenon to the deeper reason just mentioned; but, keeping to certain individual details, has not gone beyond the perception of "deviations" and "contradictions" in Deuteronomy in relation to the rest of the Pentateuch; and, recognizing the dependence of this book on the preceding books merely in such an external manner, has adopted the opinion of its later composition, ascribed it to a separate author, and assigned its origin to a very late post-Mosaic period.[2] This conclusion can receive its full refutation only by examining the particulars in detail.

The commencement of the book contains a parænetic sketch of the previous history of the people, the reason of which is to be found in that history. The prophetic standing-point in relation to the history, is here exactly maintained: it is not with the objective representation of it that the author is concerned, but with the vivid exhibition of the fundamental truth, that Jehovah is the God of Israel, that He has displayed his glory to the people in a series of miraculous facts—has chosen them for his covenant-people—and

1 Thus *e. g.* in this book there is given (ch. xxvi.), as the completion of the laws relating to sacrifices, the subjective expression to be used at their presentation, and the prayers which were then to be offered.

2 Comp. De Wette, Einl. § 156, 157, 160.

is now leading them on to their appointed destination, to inherit the land of promise. To discover contradictions here, where the previous history is so necessarily presupposed, must be particularly surprising. We have already, in the preceding part of the work, removed some of these; it is therefore only the remainder of these apparent discrepancies that can now come under discussion.

We encounter then the bold assertion, that the treatment of the history here is quite of an arbitrary character: the discrepancies and agreements found in the section, ch. i.—iii., with the previous books, admit of explanation only by supposing that use has been made of their contents from memory. The way in which the Mosaic history is here treated, is said to transport us quite to a late period.[1] The geographical notices in i. 1, 2, 5 at once display "a man who is very unacquainted with the Mosaic geography:" there is found indeed a general agreement with Num. xxxvi. 13; but what is the object sought by the names of places, and the statement of distance here given, it is difficult to say. When it is said that Moses delivered these discourses in the wilderness situated on the east bank of the Jordan, i. 1,[2] and this general statement is more precisely defined as follows: "over against Suph, between Paran, Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, and Dizahab," the only place of the whole that is exactly known is Paran. Modern geographical researches appear, however, not to have been unattended with advantage here. Thus Suph undoubtedly must be the سوف, *Suf*, mentioned by Burckhardt, situated not far from Dsherash, being the largest village in the district of Moerad, and very suitable as the northern boundary-point (Reise, i. p. 397, ff.). The place Tophel is equally suitable, if it is held to be identical with the Thofila or Thafile of the moderns.[3] Dizahab and Paran must be the southern points of boundary, and while the former is confirmed by the name ذهب, *Dahab*, a place found by Burckhardt,[4] it appears anciently to have been a district that may have extended more to the

1 Comp. De Wette, Stud. u. Krit. 1830, ii. p. 353, ff.

2 The alleged discrepancy, that ארץ מואב occurs more frequently in Deuteronomy than ערבות מואב, insignificant in itself, is of still less moment, as it is not decidedly prevalent (xxxiv. 1, 8, comp. Vater, 3, p. 494.).

3 Comp. Seetzen, in Zach, Monatl. Corresp. xviii. p. 390. Burckhardt, ii. p. 676, 1067.

4 See ii. p. 847, particularly 1075.

north up the mountains. But that the Paran of the Old Testament is to be sought more to the north than was formerly supposed, is a decided point.[1] Of still less consequence are the questionable geographical statements in ii. 8, i. 44. How mistakes could have found an entrance here, it is hard to say: had the author possessed only so superficial an acquaintance with the "Mosaic geography," he would scarcely have entered on those more precise definitions, but have satisfied himself with general statements.

Greater differences are said to be found from ch. i. 6 onwards. "The order to remove the encampment is placed too soon, before the appointment of the captains. The author appears to have confounded this appointment with the institution of the seventy elders (Num. xi.). Yet he appears to have had present to his mind Exod. xviii., though there appears no trace of Jethro's co-operation," &c. We might here at the outset be satisfied with Eichhorn's answer, that an orator is no chronologer, but is rather licensed by the excitement under which he speaks, to give but a general definition of the time of the occurrences of which he treats, and to put things together that are separated in time, provided they stand in a real or personal connexion.[2] But there is in fact no chronological inaccuracy at all; for it is only after the appointment of the Judges that the departure from Sinai really takes place.[3] The order and its fulfilment are here clearly and definitely distinguished; while the time, at which the appointment of the judges took place, is also defined in Ex. xviii. only in general as that of the abode at Sinai. It is quite natural that in Deuteronomy the influence of Jethro on that appointment of Moses does not appear. The Lawgiver is here addressing the people; and so it is naturally only the transactions that took place between these two parties that are referred to: what may have exercised an influence on Moses'

1 Comp. Burckhardt, ii. p. 974, ff., 1080.

2 Einl. 3, p. 228, ff.

3 As relates to the difference of the names Sinai and Horeb, which has also been asserted to be a point of discrepancy in this book, as compared with the preceding, we have to observe here too that the name Horeb is by no means exclusively peculiar to Deuteronomy; and, farther, that it can easily be explained how, before the people were at Sinai, it is Sinai that is spoken of, because this is the more general name for the mountain, while afterwards, on the other hand, the expression becomes more exact and is changed into the appellation of the one peak, called Horeb (Gesenius, on Burckhardt ii., p. 1078.). It is quite accordant with the present and the subsequent period to admit such a difference in the use of local appellations.

resolution did not here come under consideration, and therefore the demand that mention should here be made of the influence of Jethro's advice, is quite out of place.

"In ch. i. 22 it is said that the sending of the spies was proposed by the *Israelites*, while in Num. xiii. 2 it is *Jehovah* that gives the command for it: in ver. 42 *Jehovah* says what, in Num. xiv. 41, is said by *Moses*; and, in ver. 44, *Amorites* are named where in Num. xiv. 45, we have *Amalekites*."[1] It is easy to be seen that in these places no real discrepancies are to be found; for the commands of Jehovah existed for the people only through their announcement by Moses: hence it was a matter of indifference whether the original author or the instrument were named, since the relation of both had been sufficiently defined by all that preceded. There is as little of mutual contradiction in its being asserted, in the one place, that the sending of the spies proceeded from the people, and in the other, from Jehovah; without Jehovah's consent and commission Moses dared not have despatched them at all. Accordingly, in Deuteronomy, we have only more particular information respecting what occasioned the sending of them: it was wished for by the people, and granted by Jehovah, who then commanded what persons should be sent (Num. xiii. 1, 2), on which Deuteronomy is silent. To be able to point out a contradiction between Deut. i. 44 and Num. xiv. 45, we should require to have an exact knowledge of the relation of the Amorites to the Amalekites at that time. But this we have not (comp., however, Gen. xiv. 7.). It is, however, also expressly said in Num. xiv. 45: "The Amalekites *and the Canaanites* who dwelt on that mountain." In this we shall perceive only a complete agreement with Deuteronomy, if we consider how great was the extent of the dominion of the Amorites at that time.

"Ch. ii. 24[2] is in contradiction with Num. xxi. 21, ff., and the author contradicts himself in ver. 26." All we have to do here is to have a right apprehension of the passage in ii. 24. God here promises to give the land of Sihon into the hand of the Israelites; which is actually fulfilled, inasmuch as on that king's refusing them

[1] With regard to the above I do not comprehend, how De Wette (p. 355), while fully recognizing the verbal agreement even in expression that appears in single places, can yet maintain that these discrepancies arise from not keeping close to the written form of the Mosaic documents. How then was the latter accordance possible? Would the author, who could appropriate such minutiæ, have overlooked such important differences?

[2] On Deut. ii. 3, ff.; comp. Num. xx. see § 27.

a passage through his territory, they overcame him. That promise might properly be given, without thereby excluding the measure of making peaceable proposals, a thing which is by no means expressly prohibited; and the same God, who knew that Israel should conquer, foresaw also the king's refusal.

"The narrative in ch. iii. 18, ff., is briefer than Num. xxxii. 4, ff., and different from that. The author has no scruple in giving a different representation of the circumstances of the matter. In ver. 26 (comp. i. 37), it is stated as the cause why Moses is not permitted to enter the land of Canaan, that God was angry with Moses because of the Israelites, while in Num. xxvii. 14, and even in Deut. xxxii. 51, a transgression of Moses himself is named as the cause." Here also the discrepancies are violently deduced. The sin of Moses was occasioned by the people. Their multiplied complaints and ever-renewed revolt drove even him, who had hitherto faithfully withstood temptation, to a departure from his God. It was therefore on Israel's account that he fell into this sin; and the people also, on a retrospect, had justly to accuse themselves of the transgression of their Lawgiver, while he himself could not but candidly and unreservedly confess that the offence was his own.

While we must accordingly decidedly dispute the occurrence of historical contradictions at the commencement of Deuteronomy, we must at the same time admit, that there prevails here a great freedom in the treatment of the historical matter; by which partly more particular explanations and precise statements are given of the previous history, and partly it is shown that the author has quite an independent command of his subject, and treats it as one that is quite current with him and familiar. Thus this critical point of view now assumes a higher importance, and shows us that we are not to conceive of the author as one who is obliged carefully to follow a tradition that has already been moulded into a definite form, but as a writer who lived at that very time, and having lived through the history himself, was able to apprehend and represent it in all its aspects. The mode of representation, which thus at once gives evidence of being genuinely historical, remains true to this character throughout, even in particulars. We find just such observations as can be explained only on the admission that it is a contemporary that speaks. To these belong especially the remarks respecting the nations with which the Israelites came in contact,

which are here very numerous; but which at a later period could not have been preserved, at least not in such abundance. Such is the information respecting the two residences of the kings of Bashan, Ashtaroth, and Edrei, i. 4, comp. Josh. xiii. 31, ix. 10; the appellation "Mountain of the Amorites" is found prevailing throughout (i. 7, 19; 20, 44), while even in the book of Joshua, immediately after the occupation of the land, the name "Mountain of Judah" came into use (xi. 16, 21.). In chap. ii. 10, it is said, that the Emims had formerly dwelt in the Moabitic plain, and that they were a tall people like the Anakims, which accords with Gen. xiv. 5. In chap. ii. 11, the author gives us exact information respecting the Horites, and their relation to the Edomites. In chap. ii. 20, 21, we have an exact account respecting the Zamzummims, which also was a primitive national race of Canaan: that people is mentioned only in the present passage. The author shews at the same time that he is accurately acquainted with the Rephaim, as is still more evident from iii. 3, ff. King Og was the last of the race of the Rephaim; the two other remaining Rephaite tribes had been previously destroyed, the Emims by the Moabites, the Zamzummims by the Ammonites: Moses extirpated the rest.[1] The description of the cities of Bashan, as having "high walls, gates, and bars" (iii. 4, 5) is characteristic. These cities must have appeared thus remarkable to the Israelites, as they had been travelling hitherto only through limestone districts, where the Troglodyte mode of life prevails, as the limestone is adapted for being hewn out into artificial caves. But they had now come to regions, where the hard basalt does not admit of this, but gives occasion for the building of strong cities. The immense number of walled cities in the district of ancient Bashan, is a matter of surprise to travellers even at the present day.[2] Perhaps the basalt also may have been employed for that purpose: it is too, according to Pliny—"ferrei coloris atque duritie, unde et nomen ei dedit;"[3] and at least the sarcophagus of king Og (iii. 11)[4] must surely have been of that

1 Comp. Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. ii. 1, p. 248, ff.

2 Comp. Von Raumer, Palæstina, p. 64, ff.

3 Hist. Nat. xxxvi. 7. Ritter, Erdkunde, ii., p. 363. The Arabians also still regard that stone as being iron; Burckhardt, ii., p. 637.

4 That ברזל may be taken in that sense, is shown by the usage of Arabic and Syriac. It is incomprehensible how expositors, as Dathe, Geddes, Vater, &c., could find a difficulty here, and pronounce the passage to be non-Mosaic. Could not the Israelites at

substance, for modern travellers, as Seetzen, have discovered there sarcophagi of that kind of basalt. We have an indication of a contemporary, who reports the novelties that he meets with in the land, in the notice: "the Sidonians call Hermon Sirion, and the Amorites call it Senir," iii. 9. According to iv. 48 it is also called Sion. In a subsequent age Hermon and Sirion were distinguished from one another; comp. Cant. iv. 8, 1 Chron. v. 28. We find a notice in ii. 23 of the Avites, and their destruction by the Caphtorites. They appear otherwise even in the age of Joshua, among the princedoms of Philistia, Josh. xiii. 3.

We make the like observation elsewhere also, where we meet in this book with what is historical. The historical matter is everywhere adroitly interwoven: without the occurrence of tedious detailed explanations, we are brought to the point of view which must be assumed in connection with the individual facts, and from which alone the whole receives its just importance: comp. *e. g.* ix. 7, 8, ff., 27, 29. That the freedom which has been remarked in the treatment of the historical matter is displayed here also, only speaks in favour of the authentic character of that matter. Such a freedom we do not at least find anywhere in the later prophetic writings or the Psalms. From the misunderstanding of this characteristic, contradictions have been pointed out also in the following portion of the book, where on closer inspection the result educed is only a higher accordance. Thus ch. x. 1 is said to be in contradiction to Ex. xxxiv. 1., and x. 6, ff., to Num. iii. &c.,[1] the indefinite phrase בעת ההיא being arbitrarily pressed. The whole passage is marked throughout by the subordination of the historical narrative to the rhetorical object; and if the latter be overlooked, it is quite impossible to pass a critical judgment on the former.

But what holds good of the historical element, is still more to be maintained respecting the legal. As Deuteronomy everywhere presupposes the historical contents of the other books, and constantly refers to them, the same is the case also with its legal institutions.[2]

that time have got knowledge of that monument? Yet their territory extended even to Aroer, Josh. xiii. 25. It was just at that time that every thing of the kind must have had a peculiar interest for them, as it was something quite new.

1 Vater, iii. p. 494, ff. De Wette, Einl. p. 200.

2 Hence nothing is more unhistorical and arbitrary than to regard Deuteronomy as the earlier book, and the rest as having been derived from it, as George does in the writings of his we have referred to. This critic pays no regard at all to the circumstance,

The Israelites are expressly introduced as in possession of a multitude of laws and statutes: we find also express reference to particular preceding laws, comp. Deut. xviii. 2, (כאשר דבר לו, Num. xviii. 20), xxiv. 8, 9, (Levit. xiii., xiv.), xii. 11, 14. That God gave commandment at Sinai as to every thing that Israel should do (i. 18), is the fundamental thought of the whole of these discourses. A consideration of the particulars is also accordant with this. Thus the laws of the feasts in ch. xvi. are so far from being given completely; properly they are only brought forward by name, and the appointments respecting them are all given only for a certain place, "which God should choose as a sanctuary." This reference is that which prevails generally throughout Deuteronomy. The unity of the sanctuary is a constantly recurring thought in it. This has also been correctly recognised by modern criticism, but it has thence drawn a conclusion as to the later hierarchical character of the book.[1] But when here also we again meet with the acknowledgment,[2] that the preceding books also recognize this unity of the nation in its relation to Jehovah, and maintain it partially in a still stronger sense (Levit. xvii.); this must lead us to adopt an era, that will enable us to give a satisfactory explanation of the relation of these appointments to one another. Now this is decidedly the Mosaic period. By their residence in the wilderness, the people had been practically familiarised with the idea of their theocratic separation and unity; that idea in its higher necessity had been impressed upon the nation: it was now of importance, on their entrance into Canaan, to give prominent exhibition to this idea as that which alone could conduct them to their true destination. This unity of the people certainly admitted of being set forth as necessary, at a later epoch also; but then a point of connection in the form of fact, an historical basis for that unity, was wanting. The Exile might indeed be regarded as such a fact; but it is one, the effect of which was merely negative: it is deficient in a positive respect, wanting a definite rule, a lawgiving personality, which that period was unable to exhibit.[3]

that the other books contain the historical matter, which is presupposed in this; which is the more surprising, as he admits the unity of at least the greater part of Deuteronomy.

[1] Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 285, ff.

[2] George, l. c. p. 38, ff.

[3] [This must simply mean, that the period of the Exile did not produce a person who was a legislator, like Moses.—Tr.]

Deuteronomy throughout goes on the supposition of the occupation of the land. But it nowhere loses the point of view, that the Israelites are now for the first time just about to effect that occupation. Its laws indeed have that occupation in view as a whole: they do not bear on a certain period, or one particular object, but have regard to the relations of the life of the people in general: they proceed from the nearest time, the present, and reach even to the most distant future. The criticism of our opponents has with partiality[1] given prominence to the references of the laws to the more distant time, and has founded thereon a proof of the composition belonging to a later age. These, however, are balanced by others, which have their ground of explanation only in the admission that the origin of the work is far earlier. Indeed, the present forms here the constant basis of the future. When the land into which the Israelites are to march is described, and the blessing of God promised on its cultivation, it is said very characteristically: this is not a land like Egypt, which is artificially watered (xi. 10); which clearly shows that the writer was thinking of Egypt as the better known object, which he employs to give a more exact description of the land to be possessed. He describes the fruitfulness and the productions of that land (viii. 7, ff.) in a way that could not have occurred at all to a later writer, when the thing was commonly known. It is most earnestly inculcated that, on taking possession of the land, the idolatrous places and rites of the Canaanites were to be utterly destroyed, xii. 1, ff. The laws of war also relate entirely to that event, comp. xx. 1, 17, 18; and some things have no meaning, except as occurring in a Mosaic law, as, xx. 19, the prohibition to injure the fruit-trees, "for thou mayest eat of them" —a reason which could have no force in subsequent wars, carried on elsewhere.[2] So the highest magisterial office here appears committed to a *Shophet*, along with the priests, xvii. 9; exactly as on a previous occasion the relation of Eliazar to Joshua was established by a special ordinance (Num. xxvii. 20, 21.). On the other hand, the choice of a king is introduced as hypotheti-

1 Comp De Wette, Einl. § 160. The other reasons there adduced have already received their refutation.

2 So the passage xix. 14 (which Vater, p. 636, adduces for the opposite purpose) exactly supposes that the land was not yet taken possession of; see Staeudlin, in the Krit. Jour. d. neuesten th. Lit. 3, p. 359. Herbst, l. cit. p. 16, sq. This is shown also by the very expression ראשׁנים, not ראשׁניך, as it would require to be on the opposite view.

cal, xvii. 14. Now, if these appointments had originated immediately in the condition of a later age, the form of the representation here remains incomprehensible; for how then could the power of the *Shophet* appear here chiefly as the only normal one? The wish of the nation to have a king, clearly appears here as one not accordant with that of the Lawgiver,[1] but an appointment is laid down respecting the choice of one: the people were not to make any foreigner king, but Jehovah himself must at the same time select the king for them; and then he and his children should thus rule over Israel by hereditary descent. All these appointments can be properly conceived of only as published at a time, when as yet the kingly power had not been introduced in the nation; when the subject of concern was the general principles on which they should proceed in the case of the future choice of a king. The objections against the genuineness of the law relating to the king,[2] rest only on the general supposition, that Moses could not have spoken of kings, because he could not approve of the kingly power; while it may be said with equal justice that he must on that very account have been sensible of the duty of laying down regulations respecting it. But on the supposition of the non-authenticity, there is no explaining how these appointments appear in this particular form,[3] how they contemplate the regal authority not as in existence, but as what should arise at a future time, and enlarge on the mode of its origin.

This reference to the Mosaic age extends also to the prophetic portion of the book. The passage xxviii. 68 is here particularly important: "Jehovah shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again; and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you." These words form the conclusion of a longer prophecy, descriptive of the curse that should light upon

1 Ex verbis: *si dixeris* (cogitaveris) *constituam super me regem sicut habent omnes per circuitum nationes*, patet illum qui hanc dedit legem, rem supposuisse, quam nunquam fieri exoptabat, et præmonuisse quid fieri oporteret, si id contingeret, quod ne contingeret metuebat." Herbst, l. cit. p. 18.

2 Comp. *e. g.* Ilgen, Dissert. de notione tituli Filii Dei (in Paulus, Memorab. St. vii.), § 7. Vater, 3. p. 257, ff. 638.

3 Any more than the remark in xvii. 16, that the king should not keep too many horses, "that he may not lead the people back again to Egypt," &c.; on which Staeudlin, l. c. p. 362, justly reminds us that the passage is just expressed, as it would be by a lawgiver, who had himself been along with the people in Egypt.

the nation, if it became disloyal to God's law: they are especially threatened with a dispersion among all nations (ver. 64); yet no nation with which Israel had yet formed acquaintance as such is named, with the exception of the land of bondage. That country alone is adduced by name, as that which should anew have the mastery over Israel. Egypt appears here as the *Representative* of all the future oppressors of Israel. A fictionist of a later age, who was here only attributing to Moses his own feelings fictitiously, could not possibly have spoken thus. As to that, he must have been too plainly taught by the history of a worthier author, that at a later period there were other enemies much more to be feared than the Egyptians. Besides, he represents Egypt here as working the destruction of Israel, so that the latter should be irretrievably ruined thereby. This indeed has been thought to refer to the time of Josiah, who was himself slain in a battle against the Egyptians.[1] But, in that very age, the people had already become acquainted with Assyria as the enemy, that had already accomplished upon them a part of those predictions. At that period Egypt could not possibly have still been viewed in such a light,—neither by a writer living before the death of Josiah; for that Egypt was not then such an object of dread, is proved by the very circumstance, that Josiah ventured to engage in battle with Pharaoh:—nor subsequently, for Egypt then became humbled by Babylon, and Israel was menaced by quite another enemy than Egypt. Let us admit it, that the way in which Egypt is here designated, does not permit us to suppose that the prophecy was composed in any age but the Mosaic.—We are conducted to this conclusion also by chaps. xxix. and xxx. Here also the author speaks of a dispersion of the nation, and announces it as the culminating point of the sufferings that should befall them; but at the same time he promises a divine deliverance from this distress, if the people repented, and a renewed blessing for them. At what conclusions must we arrive, supposing that these expressions contain only *vaticinia ex eventu*? We must not regard the period previous to the Babylonian Captivity as the time of composition,[2] for the representation is too plain of the whole land as given up to desolation (כל־ארצה, xxix.

[1] See George, l. c. p. 71.

[2] So Bleek, in Rep. l. c. p. 24. De Wette, Einl. p. 206.

22); neither can we fix on the period of the Captivity itself,[1] for there is certainly a clear announcement of the Return from it, and the state of things consequent on that. Thus, according to the principle of our opponents, we are obliged to transfer this prophecy to the period after the Captivity, or at least to that of the Captivity; and so are landed in an extreme view, which leaves us unable to explain at all the relation of this section to the rest, at least to the chapter immediately preceding, ch. xxviii. But the view that we are opposing, is completely demolished also by chaps. xxxii. and xxxiii. There the author represents Israel as possessing a fixed inheritance (xxxii. 8), but as losing it in consequence of their disobedience, and as being thus humbled to the lowest point, brought back to a recognition of Jehovah, and then again crowned with victory over their foes. The starting-point of the oracle also is the Mosaic age, the occupation and division of the land: the writer has the miracles in the wilderness present to him: the whole nation stands before him according to its tribes (xxxii. 8.).

But ch. xxxiii. brings us still more into the details of that time. The separate tribes here receive a blessing, with the exception of Simeon. This circumstance is explained only by the circumstances of that age. That tribe had lost most in point of numbers, and this loss is certainly not to be regarded as being accidental, but as the consequence of that tribe's particular disobedience and apostacy (comp. Num. i. 23, with xxvi. 14); hence it is wholly passed over in the blessing.[2] The song expresses a wish respecting Judah, that he may take possession of his inheritance[3]:—could a later poet, after the occupation, have expressed such a wish, and no greater, for this tribe? Levi is praised, and Aaron in particular, because of their faithful adherence to Jehovah, which had been illustriously displayed by that tribe in the age of Moses: at a later time, it could not have been commended for the like. The blessing of Joseph is a mere continuation of Gen. xlix. 21, ff., on which the present passage entirely rests; but the prominence given to the

1 So *e. g.* Gesenius, de Pent. Sam. p. 7. Hartmann, p. 804.

2 This at least appears the only admissible cause of that omission: comp. Ewald, ad Apoc. p. 165.

3 This must be the only meaning of the phrase אל־עמו ידביאנו, "let him soon drive out his nation," (*i. e.* the one assigned him to subdue and succeed)—as is proved also by the addition ידיו רב לו. This will not in any way suit the time of the Captivity (as Gesenius, l. cit. p. 7, and Hoffmann, Comm. in Mos. bened., Anal. f. d. Stud. d. exeg. u. syst. Theologie, iv. 5, p. 6, suppose), for then it must have been השיבנו אל־ארצו.

tribe of Joseph can be explained, especially in relation to Judah, only by the composition being anterior to the times of the Davidic government.[1] The rest of the tribes also appear as in quiet possession of their power, and as sharing in prosperity and wealth, particularly Zebulon, Issachar, and Naphtali. This also agrees with early times, and not with the distracted times of the kingdom of the ten tribes. Respecting Gad, the poet mentions particularly the manner in which his inheritance is portioned out to him; the transaction, by which his district is assigned to him, is vividly before the writer's view. Reference is also made to Gad's warlike deeds; comp. 1 Chron. v. 18, ff. These circumstances, however, could appear deserving of mention only to a contemporary poet; with a later writer, one does not understand how he should go into such a description, which besides, by its pregnant brevity, presupposes a knowledge of the historical circumstances, and is obscure from its merely making allusions to them. The existence of a temporary object in Deuteronomy is very visibly manifest also in ch. xxvii. (comp. xi. 26, ff.), in the detailed description of the covenant with Jehovah, which was to be renewed on Ebal and Gerizim. It contains so much of the details of this ceremony, that there is no seeing how an inventive writer, living at a much later period, could feel an inducement to give such an account of a transaction long since past. In particular the passage itself contains much, which a later age could have no interest in inventing, such as the erection of an altar on Mount Ebal, and the offering of sacrifices upon it, which can be explained only as being a command given at a time, when there was no established holy place.[2] The way, too, in which this altar was to be built, is quite antique: comp. Exod. xx. 22.

If we give now just one glance more at the legislation of Deuteronomy in its relation to that of the preceding books, we shall find it a circumstance deserving of attention, that many earlier appointments appear here under certain modifications. The Law everywhere expressly enjoins, that nothing shall be taken away from it nor added to it; and nowhere do we find in a later writer, any kind of appointments elevated to the rank of laws.[3] Thus the book, re-

1 Comp. Bleek, l. c. p. 29. This critic also admits the Mosaic origin of this portion.

2 A late author also, since he prohibits sacrificing in other places than that selected by God, xii. 13 (Levit. xvii. 8, ff.), would have at least avoided giving here apparent countenance to what was forbidden.

3 Ezekiel, ch. xl., ff., must not be appealed to (Michaelis, Mos. Recht. i. § 9); as we

garded as originating at a later period, would be an incomprehensible enigma, if on the one hand it sanctioned that principle (comp. iv. 2, xiii. 1), and yet itself contained nothing else than a gradual continued formation of the Law, proceeding from mere rights of custom, which it now suddenly sought to clothe in that stationary form. In that case also, it would not have admitted of being placed in any sort of analogous relation to the rest of the Hebrew literature. In particulars likewise it is purely impossible to carry out the opposite view, even with any appearance of probability. Thus in ch. xii. there is no making out, how any one who found the strict appointments in Lev. xvii., given as *Mosaic*, should have undertaken to design a modification of them. If the Law in Leviticus aimed at nothing but an ideal indication of the unity of the sanctuary, then that indication might also have been sufficient for a later age; and where was the need of such alterations? Or if the law in Deuteronomy was the original, how came one to have the foolish thought of giving it a more intensified shape, while the fulfilment of it in that form was quite impossible for his contemporaries? And so, it is not easy to understand why a later author repeated these laws respecting clean and unclean animals in this way. Compare Deut. xiv. with Levit. xi. Supposing he wished to complete what Leviticus contained on that point, this will perhaps suit Deut. xiv. 4, 5, but not the remaining portion of the law. We cannot show any particular advancement of the law here, the development of a legislative principle. We can explain the repetition of the law regarding food only by a different additional occasion, that rendered a renewed inculcation of it necessary. But we cannot properly imagine, or state such a thing, as occurring in a later age. So we cannot discover, why the law respecting the manumission of female slaves in Deut. xv. 17 can abrogate that in Exod. xxi. 7, unless both enactments had their origin in the Mosaic age. Would not the same author, who dared to risk the attempt of giving out a command of his own for a Mosaic one, have much rather altered and tried to falsify what was already recognized as Mosaic, instead of exciting the greatest suspi-

there have the future only as the subject of prediction, but not by any means the present regulated according to a certain rule. The prophet does not at least represent his appointments as law, but as a condition of things which he brings into connection and harmony with the supposed law. A future form of the Theocracy is, however, quite another thing from a law that comes into force from the moment of its being established.

cion against himself by such a contradiction? So also the ordinance regarding the year of release (ch. xv.) has a close reference to the earlier appointments respecting the Sabbatic year, and the year of Jubilee. Every seventh year no debts were to be exacted, and the servants were to be let go free. This law must be grounded on a reason lying in the nature of the seventh year. In this its peculiar nature it appears previously, to wit, as the expression and development of the idea of the Sabbath. Now here the important practical aspect of that theocratic principle comes particularly into view. It is a beneficent law, conferring advantage on the poor and on servants, so that the benefits of the Sabbath-day, as well as of the Sabbatic year, as days and years of rest, were particularly displayed in the case of those, who were the most oppressed classes in the nation. But, reversing this connection, one has sought to regard the ordinance in Deuteronomy as the earliest, since the simple principle of beneficence (it is thought) has given rise to those more extended and more abstract developments.[1] But the Sabbath itself, in its original appointment, by no means originated in a mere principle of beneficence; such an institution must have had a higher cause,[2] to be able to maintain itself as one that laid hold of the entire life of the people, which was simply the consequence of such an institution,—an institution most intimately connected with the theocratic principle, and the idea of a nation consecrated to God; and which, existing as a truly sacred ordinance, because of its characteristic reference to the highest destination of the people, was capable of extending to the practical life of the nation, and developing itself there. When Deuteronomy, therefore, lays stress on this practical element of the law, the theoretical grounds of the law itself are presupposed; it must be capable of being proved to be a sacred institution, founded on Jehovah's character and the nature of the nation's calling; for only in that case could the demand made in Deuteronomy be the subject of requirement. Besides, the reason that is here subjoined to this prescription, that the people of Jehovah should rule over many nations and get possession of them (xv. 6, ff.), arises most appropriately from the views of the Mosaic period; when the large evidence of the

1 See George, l. c. p. 28, ff.

2 As George himself also must admit, p. 196, ff.

goodness of the Lord even in earthly gifts, most impressively demanded that the same disposition should be shown towards one's neighbour.

Thus the internal characteristics of Deuteronomy also, indicate very decidedly the Mosaic age as the period of its composition.

§ 30. CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE HISTORICAL CREDIBILITY AND MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

Were the result of our researches thus far to amount simply to this, that the Pentateuch contains nothing contradictory of the opinion of its Mosaic authorship, we should even then be obliged to yield credence to the testimony of the work respecting its own composition. Whoever gives due consideration to the difficulty attending the positive internal evidence of a work for its own authenticity, especially in the present instance, in the case of laws in particular, will not think himself justified in demanding more. Besides, a closer examination of the work leads to a far more important conclusion than that which is merely negative. The mythical view cannot be carried out in its application to the book; it breaks down altogether. That which modern criticism has adduced as peculiarities in the mode of narration pursued in the Pentateuch, when rightly apprehended, forms only a proof of the strictly objective historical character of the work. Of this nature, in the first place, is the want of completeness complained of in the accounts,[1] which points us everywhere to a definite plan of the narrator, whose ideas of completeness were certainly essentially different from those of modern critics. His representation will, and must, be regarded as complete, if his object be considered, which was to represent the historical preparation and foundation of the theocratic institution. His strict adherence to this object shows that his whole personal views and feelings were absorbed in that idea—that he lived in it; that there is here an overpowering of the subjective life by the objectivity, produced by facts, circumstances, and proceedings—a course of exertion confined to a certain strictly limited sphere, and maintained with the greatest possible certainty on this standing-point. Thus then we are not led to the conclusion that there was a "de-

1 De Wette, Einl, § 144.

ficiency in information," but to the very opposite view; namely, that the writer had such a knowledge of the time, and of its higher significance, as we could expect to find only in a contemporary, who possessed a truly commanding comprehension of his age, and saw far beyond it. We are brought to the same conclusion by an examination of the second peculiarity that has been remarked, which relates to the pragmatism and mythology of the work.[1] "The causes that lie in the divine will (it is said) are pointed out with great precision, but the natural causes—human motives, and the natural connection of events—are given very imperfectly. Connected with this is the fact, that so many of the occurrences narrated are in contradiction to the laws of nature, and presuppose an immediate interference of divine agency." If we consider this view, in the first place, in its relation to the subject, the peculiarity that has been remarked will only appear perfectly in accordance with it. If it was the object of this work, to give the biography of a single man (as that of Moses) *in extenso;* then the remarks just quoted are quite well founded, and we should then be obliged, however great the events in the life of such a man, to regard the narratives as defective and incomplete, and thus to call in question the authenticity of the account given of it. But that most certainly is not the case. The subject of the work is the kingdom of God on the earth, certainly a peculiar, and, indeed, quite a unique subject, which must, however, because of this peculiarity attaching to it, claim for itself the character of being marked by what our opponents themselves rightly designate, as the immediate interference of the divine agency. Thus by this argument we are brought precisely to the conclusion, that the subject of our narrative is found faithfully reflected and carried out in it, and that the narrative, with unbroken consistency, presents a clear exhibition of its ultimate object. But, in the next place, that remark of our opponents is important also in relation to the individual character of the narrator. He gives himself out as one who can state "with great precision the causes that lie in the divine will"—as one who is wonderfully distinguished by his acquaintance with the divine plan of salvation. If he then really communicates what we are justified in expecting from such a profession, we are obliged to re-

1 De Wette, § 145. Comp. Bertholdt, 3, p. 779, ff.

cognize him as a partaker of special divine illumination, which rendered him capable, not only of reporting single miraculous facts, but also of connecting them in such a way that we can behold vividly introduced into the subject the administration of God in the midst of his kingdom, as a whole, and on a large scale.

But, instead of that, our neological criticism calls to its aid a strange premise, and thus comes to different conclusions. Thus far the description given by De Wette of the character of the narrative, has been correct, that is, historically true and faithful. But on proceeding to a closer examination of it, he no longer adheres to the facts of the case. "Since (he proceeds to say) it is at least a matter of doubt to the cultivated understanding, whether such miracles really took place," &c. Here we have "the cultivated understanding" suddenly introduced as the highest court of appeal: now, it denies miracles in general—yet for all this the matter is not meant to be brought to so serious an issue. In the earlier editions of his Introduction, the expression was, "it is a decided point," but this is now changed into "it is at least a matter of doubt;" so that the tribunal of the "cultivated understanding" has thus voluntarily abdicated its sovereign authority, and professes to be merely a subjective opinion. There is no more precise description given of the peculiar nature of the miracles of the Pentateuch: thus one does not perceive at all, why just *such miracles* as it reports must be matters of doubt. But the cultivation of the understanding has merely got so far, as to doubt the miracles, viewed as single facts; it has not obtained a perception of their higher unity; for what he previously designated in general as "the divine will," is precisely the centre, from which those facts are derived. That divine will, however, is as much a unique as a concrete thing; and, as such, it is the realization of the idea of the divine kingdom. But this first miracle, which also comprehends in itself all the rest as its development, being and remaining such as has been said, the origin of the documents that contain an account of it may be regarded as being contemporary with it, or may be assigned to a later period; and thus the cultivated understanding has gained no advantage by its denial of miracles.

In these remarks we have pointed out the fundamental error of modern criticism, which consists in breaking up the entire idea of the miraculous origin of the Theocracy into single isolated occur-

rences, which contradict the common course of nature. Hence the decision is passed—"that it is not a contemporary narration, nor derived from contemporary sources; and that the miraculous portion of the contents is to be ascribed to the fancy of later narrators." In that case we should have in the Pentateuch only separate contradictory traditions, mutually refuting one another—single detached extraordinary facts, having no higher reference; some fragments, rescued from antiquity, mixed with the ideas of a far later present time, and therefore destitute of internal unity. The exegetical error has here produced the dogmatical error, which in turn has exercised an influence on the former. But if, on the contrary, we firmly hold to the fundamental thought of the whole book, we shall find that thought not to be a later idea; since in general, from its nature, it is not and cannot be a mere idea, an empty abstraction, but can have its existence only where the fact has given rise to the idea. Thence follows the internal identity of the actual and the ideal in the contents of the Pentateuch: the author, living in the idea of that book, cannot have occupied a position that would place him at a distance from the facts, since otherwise he must have been an inventor—which, however, is impossible in the nature of the case; he must have lived amidst the facts, and thence have acquired those higher feelings that animate his writings: in short, he must have been a contemporary.

We have endeavoured to point out in detail not only the untenableness of the mythical view, but also the internal historical truth of the statements of the work, showing that the particulars also bear evidence throughout that they are not invented and fabulous. Our opponents even make concessions here, which testify best against themselves. It has been several times remarked, that even sceptical critics, such as De Wette and Von Bohlen, have not been able to make out their case by the supposition of mere fiction, and have felt themselves compelled to recognize a traditional element. Vater also admits this in general, in a remarkable manner. "A sober sense of truth (he says) is expressed, for the greater part, in the contents of these books" (p. 597.). "Concerning the following earlier ages also, even that of Abraham, the authors of these books display no such exact knowledge, that *the most of them* might not have been written in the times of the kings, *according to the traditions that still remained.*" (p. 599.). Such expressions as "the

most of them," "according to tradition," "might," show the uncertainty here of the critical opinion. This opinion, however, is also completely refuted by the fact, that, on the supposition of the traditional preservation, those ingredients cannot be pointed out, which are wont to be interspersed in an embellished version of the tale, and are proofs of its later origin.

The proof of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, derived from its internal structure, has certainly not been conducted always by its defenders with proper acuteness and consistency. The point of the proof is just this, that the structure of the Pentateuch—viewed both in general and in particulars, both in a literary-historical respect, and also in a religious respect—is an inexplicable enigma, supposing Moses was not the author of it. In order to maintain the theory of its later composition, it is necessary to suppose an author, who wrote just as Moses would have written, a supposition truly fabulous! Instead, however, of taking into view the whole of the Pentateuch, its historical accounts, relating both to domestic and to foreign history, as well as its legislative and prophetical contents, one has improperly kept to separate particulars and urged these. It is only in the totality and the harmonious agreement of all the single points, that the force of the evidence lies.

Thus especially, the "Egyptian spirit" of the book has, with too great partiality, been prominently brought forward, as showing that the author's knowledge of Egypt is such as cannot be attributed to a later age. In our own criticism also we have adduced several traits of that kind, to which we have given weight, and have shown that there is no foundation for the view that the Pentateuch contains mistakes as to the customs and the history of Egypt. But it is then objected by our opponents[1] that such an acquaintance with Egypt might have been obtained in consequence of the political and mercantile connection with that country, which existed in later times. Now here the possibility is certainly admitted, of a later author furnishing himself with this information, so as to make a certain learned display with it, and to interweave it adroitly with the context, and thus to reproduce the Mosaic age (comp. *e. g.* Gen. xiii. 10, xlvii. 20, ff.; Num. xiii. 23; Deut. xi. 10, ff., and § 22, 23.) But by this admission our opponents have not gained

[1] See especially Hartmann, p. 726, ff. V. Bohlen, p. li., ff. De Wette, Einl. p. 190.

the slightest advantage. For this is allowing that what we here encounter is such an acquaintance with Egyptian antiquity, as a later writer was capable of acquiring only by means of learned researches into it, since the notices in the Pentateuch are partly of an historical nature, and could therefore be obtained in a later age only in that manner. In order therefore to justify the view of our opponents, much more must be proved, than merely the existence at a later epoch of an external connection with Egypt: this kind of literary intercourse, amounting to a learned study, must be shown by analogies to have had a place among the Hebrews. But, above all, it must be proved, that we are driven by every other consideration with unavoidable necessity to that very remote supposition; and, therefore, that there is no admitting the opinion that would most readily occur to us, that this knowledge of Egyptian affairs is the result of a long and close early cohabitation on the part of the people with the Egyptians. Taken thus, however, in its general reference, the argument of our opponents is seen to be an opinion utterly inadmissible, since, as has been shown, everything on the contrary leads us to the adoption of the Mosaic age as the true epoch. This inadmissibility becomes very manifest, when we observe the worthlessness of the subterfuge to which they have recourse, when the exact acquaintance exhibited in this work with the ancient condition of Canaan, and the accounts it contains of the primitive nations of that country, &c., are brought against them. Nothing then remains for them but to affirm, that these accounts "are very defective and contradictory,"[1] the contrary of which we have shown in the previous discussion.

As the defence of the Mosaic authorship was thus taken up formerly on a one-sided position, so positive mistakes also were committed in the maintenance of it. To these belongs, in particular, the opinion that was formerly entertained by Eichhorn, in reference to the book of Numbers especially, of the existence of a diary of Moses, in which different sections were inserted beside one another, in chronological disorder, without regard to their contents. Here all that remained for the opposite party was indeed an easy task, namely, to set hypothesis against hypothesis, and to represent these

[1] De Wette, Einl. p. 190. Vater, p. 600, ff., to whom De Wette refers, hesitates between the supposition of tradition and that of invention; in either case, however, the character given by De Wette would be the necessary consequence of such a supposition.

sections of diverse contents as proceeding from different authors and partly in very late times, and to recognize only single elements as being Mosaic.[1] But the very thing which is made the foundation of these hypotheses, namely, the confusion and diversity in the contents of the sections, has been shown to be unsafe and untenable.

The defenders of the genuineness of the Pentateuch conceived on the other hand that they would be more successful in maintaining the opinion, that *interpolations* were to be met with in the work, the assertion of which, however, by no means militated against its genuineness.[2] By the other side this procedure has justly been charged with the reproach of arbitrariness, inasmuch as this critical operation has cut away really integral portions, and is supported solely by the supposition that this or that passage cannot have been written by Moses.[3] We also maintain, that the text of the Mosaic books is no less free from interpolation than the other books of the Old Testament, and forms no singular exception in this respect; and that the hypothesis of interpolations was a mere pillow for the negligence or incapacity of critics, in order to get rid of the trouble of proving the genuineness of the disputed passages. From the idea of interpolation to that of revision is so short a step, especially if we conceive of the latter according to the sense and spirit of the East, that we should find it impossible to oppose any barrier to the latter supposition, if the former could be proved. But the assertion that interpolations are to be found in the Pentateuch, is just as arbitrary as that which is set up against it, which regards those passages indeed as original component portions of the work, but draws from them the conclusion of its later composition. Thus the formula[4]—"*even to this day*"—is no more a sign of interpolation than it is of a later authorship. The only question in connection with the meaning of the formula, (which is wholly relative,[5]) is,

1 See Vater, 3, p. 543, ff.

2 Comp. *e. g.* Jahn, p. 60, ff. Ch. Fr. Fritsche, Prüf. d. Gründe u. s. w. p. 135. Rosenmüller, Prolegg. p. 36. Eichhorn, in many places. Herbst, l. cit. p. 52, sq. et alibi.

3 Comp. particularly Von Bohlen, p. lxxxiv. ff.

4 Comp. De Wette, Einl. § 147, a.

5 Comp. upon it, König, ATliche Studien. Erstes Heft. S. 94, ff., where it is also well pointed out that the notion of "a long time" (ימים רבים) is employed by Hebrew writers respecting the most different spaces of time, so that these modes of expression are quite of a relative nature.

whether the passages where it is found could have been written by Moses or not, with an application of that formula. Respecting the passages in Genesis, where it occurs most frequently (xix. 38, xxvi. 33, xxxii. 32, xxxv. 20, xlvii. 26), no one can maintain that the formula is un-Mosaic, since they all relate to that ancient history, with reference to which an author of the Mosaic age might justly so express himself. So also in Deut. ii. 22, x. 8, xxix. 3, the formula refers to the occurrences in the wilderness, which at that time were long past. It is only iii. 14 that bears upon a fact which happened only in the latter part of Moses' time; but evidently Moses might as well say that the name *Jair's villages*, which originated at the time there spoken of, had been preserved even to the time when he recorded the statement, as a later writer might so express himself. Thus the so-called "archæological explanations," as well as the twofold names of cities, &c., have in like manner been misunderstood: the notice, considered by itself, can here be no criterion at all: all depends in each case on the particular nature of the passage, and when viewed in this respect we have not been able to discover in any of the passages, in our criticism of them, a non-Mosaic element.

There is only one passage that requires to be more particularly settled, as to this point; to wit, the statement respecting the death of Moses in Deut. xxxiv. Not only do the contents of this section fix it as being written after the death of Moses,[1] but its relation also to the foregoing shows it to be a separate piece from that. For as ch. xxxi. contains the *conclusion* of the work, where Moses designates himself as the author of the preceding matter, as well as of the song in ch. xxxii. (to which belongs also the blessing in ch. xxxiii.); and thus the whole is represented as a work complete in itself, as far as ch. xxxiii. (comp. § 4); it follows decidedly that ch. xxxiv. is a distinct piece, plainly separated from the foregoing. Besides, this section is very closely connected with Josh. ch. i., and both these chapters have manifestly a mutual conjunction (comp. Deut. xxxiv. 9, Josh. i. 1, and the וַיְהִי in Josh. i. 1), which only gives greater force to the opinion, that this chapter, which properly does not belong to the Pentateuch, should be regarded as being

1 This has also always been recognized by sound criticism: comp. Carpzov, Introd. p. 137; "Pervulgata omnium est confessio, cap. 34, integrum, vel a vs. 5 saltem ad finem, ab auctore alio aeque tamen θεοπνεύστῳ—fuisse profectum."

simply the transition to the book of Joshua, and therefore as no doubt written by one and the same author. Ch. xxxiv. should accordingly be viewed as an *appendix* to Deuteronomy, which, however, while it plainly characterizes itself as such, is not to be placed in the same category with interpolations of the work. This would betray a like confusion of ideas, as if one were to call the eighth book of Cæsar's Commentaries *De Bello Gallico* an interpolation, while it forms a supplement to the work from the pen of another author.[1]

§ 31. THE PENTATEUCH CONSIDERED AS A LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS DOCUMENT OF ITS AGE.

We have already shown with reference to the history of the art of writing, that the Pentateuch admits of being regarded with propriety as a work that was actually written by Moses' own hand (see section 43, ff. of Gen. Introd.). In a linguistic respect also it appeared, that this book justly has its place at the head of Hebrew literature, and admirably verifies its character of antiquity and originality. (Section 31 of Gen. Introd.). It might therefore seem that, after having proved the internal structure of the book to be in complete harmony with those conclusions, enough has been done to justify the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. But the external relation of this book to its time deserves still a somewhat more exact explanation.

The Pentateuch is, in the first place, a piece of authorship, the production of its own age; and, viewed in this light, the question arises respecting it, what explanation we are to give of its relation to that same age, and to the following period. De Wette's opinion (Einl. § 163) is, that "It is absurd to suppose, that one man should have created in advance, the epico-historical, rhetorical, and poetical styles of writing in their entire compass, as well as these three departments of Hebrew literature, in their contents and spirit; and have left nothing for all succeeding authors, but to follow in his steps." This assertion involves a twofold supposition, which on a

1 Comp. Suetonius, Vit. Caes. c. 56: "Alii Oppium putant, alii Hirtium, qui etiam Gallici belli novissimum imperfectumque librum *suppleverit*." Bähr, Röm. Lit. Gesch. § 182.

closer examination is seen to be untrue. In the first place, the book is regarded as one that has arisen wholly from that age's stage of culture, while the age again, on its side, is regarded as presenting quite a rough and barbarous condition. The idea of culture must certainly, first of all, be taken here in the more confined sense of religious-ethical culture, since the Pentateuch, as being quite a religious document, can come under consideration only as to that. Now then, on the one hand, our book makes no concealment of the fact, that, viewed in reference to the mass of the people, the condition of the age could by no means be called an elevated one. Accordingly, neither does it connect itself with that age, but it goes back to a better anterior time, from which the present had greatly deteriorated—even to the ancient history of the Israelitish patriarchs, to which it then immediately annexes the history of the present. But where such a primitive age has preceded, there, when it is vividly apprehended, a lofty spiritual excitement exists already, which, when transplanted to the soil of the present, can but produce again new fruits. In this way the Pentateuch at once appears as a work rising to an elevation far beyond its time, and we can then proceed to speak only of the influence which it has exercised again upon its age. And there we discover that not only are individuals among the people affected with prophetic inspiration (Num. xi.), but a literary life proper to the age is also formed. Mention is made of "men speaking in proverbs," משלים (Num. xxi. 27), belonging to the age, whose songs are sung by Israel (xxi. 17); and "the book of the wars of Jehovah," which is referred to in that very place in ver. 14, indicates the existence of a collection of poetical productions of that kind. At that time there already existed in connection with public worship a class of sacred poems, to which a multitude of passages bear reference (see Gen. Introd. § 31, near the beginning.). Now, when we thus see, on the one side, the point of connection with its age, and on the other the influence and excitement exercised upon its age by a literary document, we are justified in recognizing it as one that stands in close connection with that period.

It also follows, however, that, such being the case, the literary labours of a Moses must not be conceived of after that abstract disjunctive fashion; which ranges beside each other the historical, the rhetorical, and the poetical departments as different branches. For that age no such division can as yet be spoken of, least of all in the

case of the exalted divine ambassador. His discourse, even when expressed in those different forms, is animated and pervaded by only one spirit: this essentially religious theocratic spirit is the internal point of union, the strong bond, which keeps together those different forms of literary labour, and presents them as the work of one man. It was the very peculiarity of the vocation of the Lawgiver, that he swayed a dominating influence over the theocratic system in this manner, came in contact with all its relations and bearings, and united in himself that which a later period disjoined, its vocation being to advance and develope that in its separate particulars. After a concrete, and therefore a genuinely living mode, the historical element here pervades the legal, and both these again pervade the rhetorical, while the poetical element stands in the closest relation to the history; and thus we see in this concrete unity, not something that is arbitrarily to be severed, but just a distinctive mark of that writer, of whom alone under the Old Covenant it could be said, that no other had stood in so immediate a relation to God as he. Hence there is not in fact any imitation on the part of later writers; at least that would be a most defective designation for the necessary historical connection, which all the later theocratic life must have with its original foundation.

In thus considering the Pentateuch solely as a religious document, we also find its character as such sufficiently confirmed by the expression it contains respecting itself. Nowhere does it appear as the private record of its author, but its public ecclesiastical destination is expressed in the plainest terms. It is the object of a number of special regulations, to represent the work as one fully possessed of public authority. According to Deut. xxxi. it is committed in the first place to the hands of the priests and the elders. Deuteronomy several times contains the command, that the Law is to be kept free from additions and adulterations (*e. g.*, iv. 2); to which divine injunction that measure bears a reference. In xvii. 18 the priests were represented as guardians of the Law; then we have the fulfilment of this expression given us in xxxi. 9. In addition to this, there is a twofold injunction; the Law was enjoined to be read to the people once in every seven years, and farther, the entire book was to be deposited at the side[1] of the Ark

[1] [This is a better translation of the Hebrew מִצַּד אֲרוֹן, than "*in* the side of the ark,"

of the covenant (comp. Gen. Introd. § 6.). As Deuteronomy everywhere goes on the supposition that the other books are Mosaic documents, the greater is the necessity we are laid under not to restrict the expressions, "all the words of this Law" (v. 12), and "the book of this Law" (v. 26) to a particular portion of the Pentateuch, but to recogize them as bearing a reference to the whole. This however frees the work from all suspicion of subsequent adulteration or interpolation. A work which contains these requirements, has by them given its readers the possession of such a criterion with respect to itself, that its claims may with little trouble be either recognized or rejected. It could not have originated *out of* the circle of the priesthood; for then it never could have spoken of itself as being extant in their possession. But as little could it have originated *within* that circle; for it is expressly said, that it was to be a witness against the priests: a witness consequently which might certainly be despised or thrust aside, but which dared not, as a novel production, seek to support itself by their recognition. Supposing it was not found at the side of the Ark of the Covenant, and that the requirement of such being the proper place assigned to it, was unknown,—how then could it have been pretended that its place was there: this was putting one of the most dangerous weapons *against* itself, in the hands of those for whom the book was intended. Or, supposing that the prescription, that the Law should be publicly read every seven years, had been disregarded ever so long, that prescription certainly delivered a strong and valid testimony as to the negligence and degeneracy of the priests as well as of the people; but had not such an institution been otherwise well sustained as having a sacred authority, its non-observance would have been a sufficient proof that it was the production of a *falsarius* (forger), and it would by no means have been associated with such a requirement, especially as the priests would then be only concerned to regard such a statute as not binding.

Our opponents also are sufficiently sensible of the force of this proof, and Vater in particular has only strengthened it still more by a number of mere assertions. Thus he remarks, relying on his fragment-hypothesis, that these passages of Deuteronomy refer only

as our E.V. has it, and is followed by Hävernick in his Gen. Introd. l. c. The fact that only the two tables of stone were found *in* the ark, when it was brought into the Temple, 1 Kings viii. 9, is accordant with this.—Tr.].

to single portions of that book, with which this author was acquainted (p. 563);—that the ordinance respecting the public septennial reading of the Law, is joined with the institution of the year of release, which stands quite isolated in Deuteronomy. (p. 565—see on the other hand § 9);—that it is not plainly said in the text, whether this proclamation of the Law was prescribed only for the next seven years, or for every seven years (xxxi. 10), while usage and the context most decidedly lead us to understand a reading that was to take place every seven years; and that history, till we come to Nehem. viii., says nothing of a fulfilment of this appointment, which, as has been shown, is the very thing that makes its later origin so much the more inexplicable. On the contrary, Jahn's opinion of the case remains fully sustained by evidence, that we shall not easily find another book, the publication of which has been attended with so great publicity, and the authorship of which must have been so generally and so certainly known, that must have been transmitted to posterity so easily, indeed so unavoidably, in a state of correctness. (Einl. ii. p. 24.).

§ 32. HISTORY OF THE PENTATEUCH. TESTIMONIES TO ITS EXISTENCE. FIRST AGE: FROM MOSES TO SOLOMON.

If we endeavour to elicit the history of the Pentateuch itself from the history of the Israelitish nation, and its sacred literature, its internal structure certainly justifies us at the outset in making no small demands. This book professes to be nothing less than the basis of the entire system of theocratic life and action; its testimonies relate to the grandest miraculous acts of God, by which he glorified himself amongst Israel's ancestors; its laws impose the strictest requirements on the individual, as well as on the people collectively; its promises and threatenings embrace the whole future history of Israel. The more sensible that we are of the weight of these demands, the more delighted must we be, to be able to satisfy them here in as complete a manner, as is in any way possible with so ancient a document.

In the following history we meet with the completest confirmation of the fact of the existence of the Pentateuch, subsequently to its composition by Moses. Seldom has a book been able to

shew such complete external testimonies of its existence, as this. The force of the proof has been felt even by the opponents of the genuineness themselves; and the way in which they labour to evade the proof furnishes just so much the more valid an evidence in its favour. Some particularly striking examples may suffice here. Thus Hartmann (p. 583) professes to have made the "agreeable discovery" (sic!) that "from the age of Solomon downwards, the allusions and references to the historical parts of the Pentateuch constantly increase, and the Mosaic religious worship assumes still more evidently the form prescribed by the Pentateuch." But then, according to him, all the documents of the ante-Solomonic period belonged to the Babylonian exile (p. 559, ff.). Thus it is also quite inconsistent to recognise traces of the Pentateuch as occurring in the age of Solomon. The mode in which De Wette (Einl. p. 161) tries, by means of restrictions, to weaken the force of that proof is still more interesting. These restrictions are the following: 1. "If we leave out the suspicious testimonies of the Chronicles." This we might consent to for the present: if the books of Chronicles formed a special exception in regard to the pre-supposing of the Pentateuch, and the constant referring back to it, then it might be that we could not employ it here as a critical authority; but we should then require to insist all the more on the condition, that the remaining witnesses should be left uncurtailed. We should also expect as much, after such a reference to the Chronicles as a work forming an *exception;* but what immediately follows, shews, that the predicate "*suspicious*" is attached to the other historical documents, only with some alteration of phrase; so that properly there remains no testimony at all, nor in general is there any possible, as it is then indeed out of our power to discover where there remains a *criterion*, or any sort of objective standard, by which the utterance of that decision shall be regulated, and which shall furnish a reason to account for it. 2. "If the account given by the narrators[1] is distinguished from the history itself, and they are only admitted as witnesses for their own time." How arbitrarily that distinction between "history" and "the account of the narrators" is employed by this criticism, so that in fact no history at all is left, has been sufficiently shown in our critical examination of the Pentateuch. According to it, true

1 ["Den Vortrag der Erzähler."]

testimonies, and such as are at all authentic, are no where to be found; for, when we ask what it is that justifies that criticism in regarding this or that as belonging only to the proposed account of the narrator, we discover the reason to be just this, the existence of a reference to the Pentateuch. Thus it is constantly reasoning in a circle. 3. "And if one does not too hastily regard references to Mosaic expressions, ideas, legislation, and history, as evidences of the existence of our Mosaic books themselves;"—a distinction which would be demonstrative, only in case the proof here really consisted merely in particulars, whereas here more than ever it is the totality that must decide; or, in case the Pentateuch admitted of being broken up into separate portions, which we must most decidedly deny.

If we search now for testimonies to the Pentateuch in the period immediately subsequent to the Mosaic, we meet first with the book of Joshua. This book rests so entirely on the basis of the Pentateuch, is so completely pervaded by its spirit, and constantly refers back to it, that the attempt has been made to assign the origin of both writings, at least of Deuteronomy and Joshua, to one and the same author.[1] It is also conceded, that such references to the Pentateuch are to be found in it; yet an attempt has been made to detract somewhat from the force of this evidence by the following remarks. 1. It is said, that this book does not testify to the whole of the Pentateuch, but only to single passages that are quoted in it:[2] but this is said partly in accordance with the supposition of the correctness of the Fragment-hypothesis, partly without paying regard to the passages in which unquestionably the Book of the Law, the Book of Moses, &c., is considered as a whole (Josh. i. 7, 8, viii. 31, 34, xxiii. 6.). 2. It is said, that the passages xxiv. 26, and iv. 10, show that the Book of the Law, which is cited in the book of Joshua, contained additional memoirs not found in the Pentateuch, so that the book there intended is not properly our Pentateuch.[3] But the passage xxiv. 26, "Joshua wrote these words in the Book of the Law of God," manifestly supposes the previous existence of such a ספר (as throughout the whole of Jo-

1 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 137. Bleek, Repert. ibid. p. 49, ff. Stähelin. Stud. u. Krit. 1835, No. 2, p. 472, ff. et al.

2 Vater, 3, p. 569, ff.

3 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 151, ff. Einl. p. 203, ff. Maurer, Comm. on the book of Joshua, p. 9.

shua it is quoted in a similar manner), and annexes to it the history of its own age. How Maurer can say, that the author had met with a document in the Book of the Law, which is not extant in it now, is incomprehensible. The text certainly says not a word of such a thing. The passage, on the contrary, refers to Deut. xxxi., and means to say, that Joshua also followed the example of Moses and annexed to the Book of the Law what he had himself recorded; even as it is clear from the context, that he likewise deposited it in the holiest of all, beside the Ark of the Covenant (comp. Gen. Introd. § 6.). The passage iv. 10 occasions still less difficulty, if correctly understood. Joshua, it is said, caused the passage over the Jordan to be performed "as Jehovah commanded him," and "as Moses gave him (Joshua) command." Thus it is evidently special orders, given to Joshua, that are spoken of. But the Pentateuch also mentions, that Moses not only consecrated Joshua to be his successor by the imposition of hands, but also furnished him with commands and instructions (Num. xxvii. 23; Deut. iii. 28, xxxi. 23), without however communicating the latter. The exact obedience, with which Joshua fulfilled these directions, is plainly what is here spoken of; and thus all appearance even, in favour of the interpretation of our opponents, vanishes.

If it is then firmly established, that the book of Joshua shows an acquaintance with the whole of the Pentateuch, as a book of the Law written by Moses, and delivered to the people as a sacred and inviolable authority; critics have here no other resource than to maintain the late composition of the book of Joshua.[1] "The acquaintance of the book with the Pentateuch," indeed, forms again an important argument for the latter opinion; but as other additional reasons have also been adduced on its behalf, we must leave this point alone in the meanwhile, until we take up subsequently the more thorough discussion of it. But it may be shown, however, that our opponents, even on the admission of their view of the time when the book of Joshua was composed, gain nothing, but only lose by it. For, after all, we still have in this book a memorial, which, if composed later than the Pentateuch, yet rests only upon it, so that the Pentateuch receives a complete recognition from this book. Supposing the Pentateuch is not a genuine Mosaic writing, then the deception which has been

1 Comp. *e. g.* Vater, p. 567, ff. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 137, ff. Bertholdt, p. 762. Hartmann, p. 559 et al.

practised with it is an unheard-of deception, and one that extends much farther. Another book has then formed the continuation of its untrue and suspicious history: the spirit of falsehood has then spread epidemically, and has not been satisfied with imposing on the world one of its productions, but has continued to build systematically on such a foundation. This makes the supposition of our opponents more extensive and more enigmatical: it must then be explained, how that which, according to them, was brought out in so weak and wretched a way, could assume for itself and maintain the force of truth with such victorious power, that immediately after its origin it meets with such recognition as truth only can have,—such as falsehood, even when most cunningly contrived, never can secure: which makes our book an enigma in the history of all books.

From the book of Joshua we turn to that of Judges, which demands indeed the closer examination, as our opponents here maintain "*that it does not contain the slightest trace of a reference to the Mosaic books.*"[1] But this changeable criticism cannot, here either, exhibit by any means a uniformly constant judgment: according to Hartmann, it must candidly be confessed that the arranger of this book "*was well acquainted with the Pentateuch in its entire extent;*"—while he does not then omit remarking, indeed, that this book too owes its origin to the same period as the book of Joshua. As both these opinions are sustained by equally weak grounds on both sides, it will be necessary to go into the matter more closely.

The book of Judges certainly has for its subject a very disordered political and religious condition of the nation: it also does not give by any means a complete history of it, which in a certain respect is hardly possible, but only individual portions, single remarkable occurrences of that period. Considering the matter in both these respects, therefore, we are almost unavoidably necessitated to expect to find but little regarding the Mosaic institutions, and but few references to the Pentateuch. The less that such a result should surprise us, the more must it produce a favourable impression for the genuineness of the Pentatench, to meet even here with such a number of references to it as may be said proportionally to be *consider-*

[1] The words of De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 152, with whom Bertholdt, p. 762, V. Bohlen, p. cl. comp. cxx., agree.

able. Let us look first at the *constitution* of the nation: we still find in the times soon after Joshua a popular community (עדה), governed by the elders, as in the Pentateuch.[1] Judah has the rank of precedence among the tribes, and the chief command (i. 2; xx. 18, comp. Numb. ii. 3, x. 14, Gen. xlix. 8, ff.); although the other tribes on the north, especially Ephraim, already display jealousy, and promote division.[2] The office of the judge שפט, who is entrusted with the supreme power, appears as early as Deut. xvii. 9, ff., comp. Judg. iii. 10. On the other hand Gideon refuses, both for himself and for his sons, to be king, because Jehovah alone is king of Israel (viii. 22, ff.); which agrees exactly with Deut. xvii. 14,[3] Exod. xix. 5, 6, Deut. xxxiii. 5, and Deut. xvii. 20. The accounts given respecting the public worship and the priesthood during this period, carry us still farther. Even amidst all the confusion prevailing in Israel, we are still able to show, that whatever existed relating to those departments, was plainly derived from the Mosaic law. We meet with general mention of the *Sanctuary* (בית האלהים) at Shiloh xviii. 31; and disapproving mention is made of the private sanctuary of the Danites, which was separate from it. Ever since Joshua's time, Shiloh was the common locality of the Sanctuary; yet on solemn occasions, assemblies of the nation, &c., when *sacrifice* had to be offered, the Ark of the Covenant was conveyed also to other places, so as to fulfil the law, that sacrifice should be presented only *before Jehovah* (Deut. xii. 6, ff.). The passage xx. 26, ff. is here of particular importance, where we find that the Israelites go to Bethel, and "fast and weep *before Jehovah*;" the Ark of the Covenant was there, and Phinehas the High Priest attended upon it (עמד לפניו, comp. Deut. x. 8, where there is quite the same expression:[4] and there they offer *burnt-offerings and peace-offerings*)[5] (xx. 26, xxi. 4.). We

1 See xx. 21, xvi. 22. Comp. Studer, Comment. on the book of Judges, p. 461, ff. On the other hand, we have Vatke's authoritative assertion: "The interference of real law was a singular thing, and the people formed no community." Bibl. Th. i. p. 262.

2 See Gesenius, Comment. on Isaiah i. p. 436, ff.

3 For the addition—"like all the heathen nations"—points to the difference of their polities from the Theocracy, of which Jehovah was sole king. Vatke, on the other hand, rejects the statement of the book of Judges at once as being "unhistorical," p. 263.

4 That passage certainly does not agree very well with the views of De Wette (Beitr. i. p. 233), and Gramberg; hence they explain it at once as being a gloss! (Gesch. d. Rel. Id. i. p. 181.).

5 It is true that in the mention of שלמים here, one has professed to detect a non-

meet in this book with mention of the *Angel of Jehovah*, who reveals himself to the people quite in the same manner, as in the Pentateuch, in the journey through the wilderness (comp. ii. 1, 2, ff., where everything is *verbally* borrowed from the Pentateuch itself.). The Israelites on several occasions enquire of Jehovah, and do so according to the Law, by enquiring of the High Priest, who gives an answer by means of Urim and Thummim (i. 1, xx. 18, 27); and how strongly this idea was held, is shown by the magical notion that was entertained of the efficacy of the High Priest's vesture, the Ephod (אפוד), and the idolatrous use that was made of it; out of which it has been attempted by a very arbitrary exegesis to make an "Idol," a meaning which אפוד nowhere bears, or will admit of.[1] The Levites nowhere in the book appear as possessors of a particular portion of territory, which is agreeable to the regulation in the Pentateuch (comp. ch. i. and ii.), but they appear dispersed among the different tribes: yet, what is remarkable, they also appear as the only legitimate priests, to obtain whose services was an object of most solicitous endeavour even to those who practised idolatry.

We find mention made of *Prophets* also, though of few (iv. 4, vi. 8.). In the Song of Deborah there is found a great number of allusions to the Pentateuch, particularly to the blessings of Jacob and of Moses: comp. v. 4, 5 with Deut. xxxiii. 2;—v. 8 with Deut. xxxii. 17 (where the obscure expression חדשים is explained only by the reminiscence of that in Deuteronomy);—v. 16 with Gen. xlix. 14;—v. 17 with Gen. xlix. 13. The speech of the other prophet is full of allusions to the Pentateuch, vi. 8—10. Gideon also is acquainted with Jehovah's miraculous deeds in Egypt (vi. 13.). Attention is paid to the *Anathema* (חרם, *curse* or *devotion to destruction*), at the capture of the Canaanitish cities, according to the Law, and the custom relating to that is recognized as well-

Mosaic element, because the occasion of those sacrifices was a mournful one (see Gramberg, l. c. p. 107); but this arises from a misunderstanding of the expression שלמים, which included by no means merely *Thank-offerings*, but *Supplicatory offerings* as well. Comp. Reland, Antiqq. Sac. p. 317, sq. Tholuck, Appendix to the Comm. on Ep. to Heb. p. 71, ff. (vol. ii. p. 253, ff. of the Translation in Clark's Bib. Cab.). So even in the Pentateuch also the conjunction of עולות and שלמים is quite current.

1 As has been again asserted; last of all, by Vatke, p. 267, ff., but on very weak grounds. See the correct view, in Hengstenberg in particular, Christol. 3, p. 127, ff.

2 Comp. ch. xvii., xviii.; Studer, Comment. p. 372.

known; i. 17. In Judg. i. 20 the appointment of Moses respecting the inheritance of Caleb is quoted (see Num. xiv. 24, Deut. i. 36.). In ii. 15 it is remarked, that the threatenings delivered by the Lord, in reference to the transgression of the Law and Idolatry, were fulfilled upon Israel. In Gideon's battle with the Midianites, he employs trumpets (vii. 18, ff.), and evidently expects effective help from the use of them; and in the Law it is prescribed that the Israelites should employ them in battle with their enemies, and Jehovah would then remember his people (Num. x. 9.).—Ch. xi. is of special importance, containing the account of the transaction between Jephthah and the king of the Ammonites. The latter makes the complaint that, when the Israelites came up out of Egypt, they had taken away from him his territory (ver. 13.). But Jephthah shows him, in the most positive manner, that this complaint is not true, and at the same time enters into a detailed statement respecting the taking of the land, which agrees so exactly with the Pentateuch, that we can hardly suppose any other source for it than the employment of the Pentateuch; while its authentic character is all the less to be questioned, as the proceedings here spoken of are such as possess diplomatic accuracy (comp. Num. xxi., Deut. ii.). It has been incorrectly remarked,[1] that Jephthah's answer (ver. 15—27) is not appropriate, as it does not point out the non-violation of the territory of the Ammonites, as well as that of the Moabites. This is a misunderstanding. The earlier possessions of the Ammonites had been taken from them by the powerful Amorites, at the time of the conquest of Palestine, and it was only with the latter that the Israelites engaged in war, while they did not touch the borders of the Ammonites at all (comp. Deut. ii. 19.). Thus it is the positive side of the state of the facts that is here brought forward, from which it necessarily appeared all the more evidently how little cause for complaint the Ammonites had against the Israelites, since these had had to do with the Amorites only. Thus from this transaction we must draw the conclusion, that in the time of the Judges very exact and authentic accounts were possessed regarding the Mosaic age, agreeing so closely with those of the Pentateuch, as to suppose an acquaintance with the latter.[2]

1 See Studer, Comment. p. 288.

2 Only Gramberg, l. cit. ii. p. 131, ff., is guilty here of such shocking arbitrariness

The narrative of Jephthah's vow also (xi. 30—40) deserves here a more particular discussion. That vow, in the first place, cannot be regarded, as has often been done, as being exactly anti-Mosaic: it was only a rash vow. Jephthah vowed to offer up as a *sacrifice* to Jehovah whatever should come out of his house to meet him. It is quite an arbitrary opinion, that he must have intended only *men* [human beings],[1] which is by no means implied in the expression יצא לקראתי, which indeed cannot possibly mean, "what comes to meet me, *to receive me.*" The vow, "I will offer it up as a burnt-offering," made the thing so vowed, however, a חרם,[2] so that it could no longer be redeemed: it must at least die (Levit. xxvii. 29.). Here then lay the rashness of the vow. But the fact of Jephthah's afterwards recognizing this shows rather an adherence to the law. "He did not act contrary to the law of Moses, *as far as concerns the letter.* On the contrary, he acted quite in accordance with the letter of it. He had pronounced his vow. It had gone out of his mouth. Such a vow, according to the law of Moses, was not remissible: Num. xxx. 3, 7, 9, 13; Deut. xxiii. 24. And this is the view that Jephthah also took of his vow."[3] Thus the last thing which this passage should be adduced to prove, is the non-existence at that time of the Mosaic law.[4] But it also affords as little proof in support of the general custom of human sacrifices, with which we have nothing at all to do in connection with circumstances like those here; and in that case, to be consistent, the practice of devoting by a curse would also require to be so viewed (as Vatke also does); but then indeed, as the custom of human sacrifices would thus be regarded as being a legal institution, of which the Pentateuch consequently treats, the present passage could not serve to evidence the non-authenticity of the latter.

In ch. xiii., in the history of Samson, mention is made of *the*

as to propose for an explanation, that the accounts in the Pentateuch first arose and were formed out of those of the book of Judges. Yet he will not even admit the latter to be "tradition," but explains them as productions of the imagination!

1 So Studer, Comment. p. 292.

2 That this was reckoned as belonging to the class of vows, is shown not only by Levit. xxvii., but also by Num. xxi. 2. It is well said by Dathe: "Lex intelligenda est pro ratione ipsarum rerum, quæ erant devotæ. Si res ejusmodi non poterat *sacrificio* offerri, tamen interfici debebat, *e. g.* camelus, equus. Sic etiam homo morte erat afficiendus, non immolandus."

3 Eckermann, Theol. Beitr. v. 1, p. 62.

4 As Vatke also, p. 275, last supposes.

vow of the Nazarite (comp. Num. vi.), certainly in an extraordinary manner, arising out of special divine intervention and appointment; but in such a way that the general idea of a Nazarite, as defined by the Law, is presupposed, and the consecration of the hair of the head, to which prominence is given there as being particularly essential, is referred to in that way here also. In xiii. 4, 14, mention is made of unclean meats, which supposes certain laws respecting meats. Circumcision is likewise mentioned as a religious mark of distinction for the Hebrews, in xiv. 3, xv. 18. In xx. 6, the crime of lewdness, perpetrated by the Benjamites, receives precisely the same appellation as in the Pentateuch (זמה ונבלה בישׂראל), comp. Lev. xviii. 17, Deut. xxii. 21; and the punishment annexed to it by the Israelites is likewise defined by an exact legislative formula (בער רעה מישׂראל, comp. Gen. Introd. § 31—in the German original, p. 192, ff.).

Hence we see that in the book of Judges also, a large number, in proportion, of references to the Mosaic institutions may be pointed out. But complaint is made of the want of express citations of the Pentateuch; yet, from its frequent *verbal* agreement with the Pentateuch, the opinion is held, that it supposes the existence of the Pentateuch as a written document. But instances also occur where express mention is made of that work, as, iii. 4, מצות יהוה אשׁר צוה את אבותם ביד משׁה ; i. 21, כאשׁר דבר משׁה.[1] Thus the narrator not only remarks, that Israel had revolted from the divine commandments, but also when they acted in accordance with the Mosaic appointments. This, therefore, cannot be adduced as a distinguishing mark, to sustain the proof of this book being an exception from the other books, in regard to the mention of the Pentateuch.

§ 34. CONTINUATION. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Since we have arrived at so favourable a conclusion as to the previous existence of the Pentateuch, even from the single and detached histories of the book of Judges, we must maintain the same

[1] These and like citations are just related, as the formulæ قال تعلى and قال النبي are, by which the Arabians indifferently cite the Koran: comp. *e. g.* Vit. Saladini, ed. Schult. p. 16, 18, 24, et al.

thing still more decidedly as to what is supplied by the far more complete accounts given in the books of Samuel. The accounts at the commencement of these books, at once supply us with a multitude of references to Mosaic institutions. We find here Eli, as High Priest of the race of Aaron, but of the family of Ithamar, not of Eleazar (1 Chron. xxiv. 5, ff.). But mention is also made immediately of threatenings of punishment against the posterity of Eli, which were fulfilled in the reign of Solomon (1 Kings ii. 27.). Thus the truth of God's promise is sustained, that the High Priesthood should remain in the family of Eleazar, Num. xxv. 10, ff. The sanctuary, besides, has its priests, among whom the sons of Eli are brought forward by name, with the intimation indeed that they alone present the sacrifices (i. 3, ii. 11, ff.). The book says of them, that they knew not Jehovah, nor the right of the Priests with the people (E.V. "*priests' custom with the people,*" משפט כהנים את־העם, ii. 13.). If we look at the context, we shall see that it is the laws respecting sacrifices that are intended, Lev. vi. 7, Num. xviii., by which a share of the sacrifice was assigned to the priests; which laws are repeated once more in Deut. xviii. 1, ff., with an express reference to the previous appointment on the subject, and in the latter passage it is said: זה יהיה משפט הכהנים מאת העם, ver 3. Here then we have in Samuel a *verbal* quotation from the Pentateuch, and exact regard is had here to the prescription, that the fat should first be burned, and then the priest should have his portion, which the sons of Eli here demand to have first.[1] The expression הצבאות פתח אהל מועד, ii. 22, comp. Exod. xxxviii. 8, is quite as much verbally taken from the Pentateuch; whether we understand it to refer to women who were keepers of the Temple, or to women who came to sacrifice and worship. At the same time the narrative shows that the sanctuary was much frequented, and that sacrifices were presented there in abundance. The Ark of God stands in the sanctuary, and its cherubic figures are incidentally mentioned (iv. 4, comp. 2 Sam. vi. 2);[2] and the lamp of God burns there (iii. 3); which proves the existence

[1] Hence there is nothing strange in the statement, that they demanded to have the flesh raw, whereas it was commonly given cooked, since in general the sacrifices were frequently concluded with common meals. Gramberg, on the other hand, discovers here that they presented flesh already cooked, as a sacrifice, and finds accordingly that we have here a non-Mosaic usage! Gesch. d. Rel. Id. i. p. 109.

[2] Comp. Num. vii. 89; and De Dieu, Crit. Sac. pp. 61, 68.

of the law mentioned in Ex. xxvii. 20, 21; Levit. xxiv. 2, 3. Reference is made in the discourse of a prophet, ii. 27, ff., to the acts of Jehovah in Egypt, to the selection of the priestly family, and the publication of the law of sacrifice.

But the narrative in 1 Sam. vi. is of particular importance, relating to the fetching away of the Ark of the Covenant from Beth-shemesh, to which place it had been sent back by the Philistines with gifts. The inhabitants of this city had looked into the sacred Ark (vi. 19), which no one, not even the Levites, was permitted to do (Num. iv. 15, ff.); and the Levites of the Levitical city of Beth-shemesh carry the Ark, according the Law[1] (vi. 15.).[2] Even the fact mentioned in vii. 1, that Eleazer, the son of Abinadab, was nominated to be the keeper of the Ark, certainly involves nothing illegal, when the circumstances are considered. The two sons of Eli, and Eli himself, had fallen shortly before; the Tabernacle was at a distance; and therefore the Ark is brought to the Levitical town of Gibeah.[3] Now here again the house of Abinadab was unquestionably that of a Levite. Hence Eleazar's remaining here as keeper of the Ark, is quite in order; he is by no means nominated to be priest, but all that is done is to commit to him in extraordinary circumstances an extraordinary Levitical duty.[4] This, however, appears presently to have given rise to a proper priestly function, since there were now properly two sanctuaries—yet, in spite of the uncommon circumstances, there still remains a remarkable attention to order: for the two High Priests, whom we meet with in David's time as connected with the two sanctuaries,[5] namely, Zadok and Abiathar, are both *of the family of Aaron*. When we see that the descendants of Aaron were so well aware of their rights even in such times of oppression and confusion, as to maintain them even in contradistinction to the Levites, while the Levites again maintained theirs with regard to the laics; we must conclude that

[1] [There appears to be something defective in this sentence, arising perhaps from oversight.—Tr.].

[2] See the justification of this fact, in opposition to De Wette and Gramberg, in Keil, üb. d. Chr. p. 342, ff

[3] For Gibeah and Gibeon are identical: comp. Josh. xxi. 17; Movers, üb. d. Chr. p. 293, ff.

[4] Which is not contradicted by 1 Chron. xv. 13, which passage simply refers to the illegal mode of *conveying* the Ark of the Covenant.

[5] Comp. Movers, l. cit. p. 291, ff.

all these institutions had in fact a very sure objective foundation, which we cannot possibly trace to any thing else than to the Law of Moses.

Samuel is a striking phenomenon of this age. The way in which he offers sacrifices at different places, and builds altars, appears at the first glance to be contrary to the Mosaic Law. But if we look more closely at the life of this man, as presented to us in the sacred history, we shall discover in it, not only satisfactory solutions in explanation of that phenomenon, but we shall also meet with a remarkable confirmation in it of the fact of an adherence to the Mosaic Law. Towards the end of his life he declares before all the people, that he takes Jehovah to witness, who "appointed (עשׂה—E.V. "*advanced*") Moses and Aaron, and who brought the fathers out of Egypt. When Jacob had gone into Egypt, then the fathers cried to Jehovah, and he sent Moses and Aaron," &c. (1 Sam. xii. 6, ff.). On that solemn occasion the man of God thought nothing of more urgent importance, than to point the people to the known, but for a long time not sufficiently acknowledged, displays of the divine righteousness (צדקות), as narrated in the Pentateuch, in connection with the residence of the people in Egypt. It would then indeed be more than surprising to discover in the other parts of this man's life and conduct, an open contradiction of the Law of Moses, whom, along with Aaron, he regarded as being a divine messenger, and an instrument of Jehovah. But the vocation of Samuel is one so peculiar, that we necessarily perceive in it sufficient reasons to explain to us his mode of procedure. He is consecrated to the service of Jehovah from his youth up. The statement respecting this matter pre-supposes as known (1 Sam. i. 11) not only the law of Nazariteship (Num. vi.), but also the law respecting the age of service for the Levites, which began with the twenty-fifth and ended with the fiftieth year (Num. viii. 23–25); hence the extraordinary character of the vow here consists in this, that the boy was to be a minister of Jehovah "all the days of his life" (1 Sam. i. 11.). Thus Samuel was not only a Nazarite, but also a Levite, and as such specially consecrated to God.[1] As such he performs the services proper to the Levites in the Tabernacle,[2] and wears a

1 We find it so according to the family-registers in Chronicles, the credibility of which, with reference to this very point, is excellently shown by Movers, l. cit. p. 275, ff.

2 Observe the agreement of 1 Sam. ii. 11, היה משרת - - את פני עלי הכהן with Num. viii. 26, שׁרת את־אחיו.

linen ephod,[1] in distinction from the costly ephod of the high priest (comp. 1 Sam. ii. 18, 19, with ii. 28.). But besides this his priestly vocation, Samuel has also a prophetic vocation, and is universally recognized as a *Nabi* (iv. 20, 21.). By uniting in himself this twofold vocation, Samuel's position in the nation is properly that of a reformer of the priesthood and of religion. But it would be wrong to regard his agency as being in opposition to the Law. He is engaged throughout in destroying the worship of foreign deities, and insists on the sole recognition of Jehovah as the rightful King of Israel. The extraordinary circumstances of the time, the deeply rooted apostacy from Jehovah, the equally great unfaithfulness of the people and of the priests, urgently demanded such an extraordinary man, who appears as an intercessor for sinful Israel with Jehovah (vii. 9, xii. 19, ff.), and whose extraordinary vocation is proved and justified by his whole procedure. But as such he must also at that time employ extraordinary means, the object of which was to accustom the mind of the people again to the legal regulations of Jehovah's service in sacred offerings. Hence we frequently find Samuel performing sacrifice, and building altars in honour of Jehovah. But that the prophet does so by an extraordinary command of Jehovah, and will in this matter only admit of obedience to such commands, is clear from the account of the unseasonable sacrifice of Saul (ch. xiii.). If then Samuel's conduct in this respect can by no means be regarded as "un-Levitical," we are required to maintain this all the more as we also see him in other things strictly adhering to the Law of Moses. This is especially shown in 1 Sam. viii.—x. The remark has previously been made, that the law in Deut. xvii. respecting the kingly office is so expressed as to convey a disapproval of it, while it still permits its introduction. Now this is also the very character of Samuel's procedure here, inasmuch as he agrees to the people's desire only upon receiving an express command from God. Then again the law required, that the new king should be selected by Jehovah, and this also is exactly what is done. Farther it is expressly said, that Samuel should declare to the people the "legal right[2] of the

1 Like the common Levites (1 Sam. xxii. 18), and even private persons on solemn occasions of divine service, 2 Sam. vi. 14.

2 [By the circumlocution of "*Legal right*," I have tried to represent the word *Recht*, which answers to the Latin *Jus*, and may often be rendered by our word *Law*, which in this place however might mislead. *Privilege* or *prerogative* might have been better

king," 1 Sam. viii. 9, ff., respecting which we are then informed that Samuel inserted it in the book, and laid it up before Jehovah (x. 25.). Here also we have a clear reference to the Pentateuch, since Samuel deposits this public document by which he bears witness of this occurrence, in the place where the book of Jehovah's covenant with the people was already laid. This then quite sets aside as inadmissible the requirement, that here at any rate mention should have been made of the book of the law.[1] For that which was prescribed in the law was observed on this occasion, as has been shown. The proper "legal right (משפט) of the king"[2] was not stated in the Pentateuch; which contained, beside what has been mentioned, merely prescriptions for the moral conduct of the king. Consequently, it is impossible to see how the law should have been particularly cited here. Another important circumstance is that which is mentioned in 1 Sam. xv. How exactly Samuel here insists on the fulfilment of the law, is shewn in his prophetic message, in which he gives orders for the war against the Amalekites. There is in this the most unmistakeable reference to the passages Ex. xvii. 8, ff.; Deut. xxv. 19, 20. Saul recognizes this obligation; he even knows that such a punishment does not attach to the Kenites (xv. 6, ff.). What can be the source of this acquaintance with what had happened more than 400 years before in the wilderness? What can be the origin of that command of Samuel's, the unconditional execution of which he requires, and the disregarding of which he considers so decided an act of apostacy from Jehovah? It is incomprehensible how modern criticism can here complain of the want of a "*matter-of-fact reference* to the Pentateuch;"[3] for it is just here that we have *only* matter-of-fact references to it, which therefore deserve quite a different treatment at the hands of this kind of criticism, from what they receive.[4]

Samuel's reformatory endeavours had a very favourable influence: the ancient mode of worship, which had been so generally forgotten, again met with a response in the hearts of the people. This is shewn among other things by the frequent mention of

still. Our E. V. renders the Hebrew word by *manner*, meaning thereby such a custom as amounts to law.—Tr.]

1 De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 152.

2 Comp. on that, Buddeus, H. E. Vet. Test. ii., p. 266.

3 See De Wette, Einl. p. 207.

4 In Samuel's speech xv. 29, there occurs a reminiscence from Num. xxiii. 19.

sacrificing in these books:—indeed it is particularly worthy of remark that even Saul formally practices a certain display as to sacrifice, and at the same time exhibits a self-righteous pleasure in it, so that Samuel is obliged to remind him, in genuine prophetic fashion, of the internal signification of sacrifices, and of the obedience which he owes to God, and which is better than sacrifice and the fat of rams, xv. 22, ff. There cannot well be any description of sacrifices, that is not mentioned in these books. *Burnt-offerings* frequently occur; comp. 1 Sam. vii. 9 (here is the expression כליל, comp. Deut. xxxiii. 10); x. 8, xiii. 9, xv. 22, et al.;—so also *peace-offerings*, שלמים, which are presented voluntarily on solemn occasions (as on concluding the Covenant with Jehovah, Ex. xxiv. 5), comp. 1 Sam. xi. 15; xiii. 9; 2 Sam. vi. 17;—the gifts of *first-fruits* תרומות, which required to be paid at the Tabernacle and to the priests, are mentioned 2 Sam. i. 21 (שדי תרומות);—*sin-offerings* are likewise mentioned, indeed it appears that even the priests of the Philistines were aware that these were presented to the God of Israel as an atonement, 1 Sam. vi. 3, ff.;—*meat-offerings* (מנחות) are found mentioned, 1 Sam. ii. 29, iii. 14, xxvi. 19 (where also the expression ירח מנחה reminds us of Lev. ii. 2, 9, 12), and the chief parts of all meat-offerings, 1 Sam. ii. 29, comp. Levit. ii. 12, ff.;—we have a description of the privileges of the priestly race in 1 Sam. ii. 28, to wit, that God had selected them from among all the tribes, to offer sacrifice on *his altar* (which therefore appears as the particular altar which was at the Sanctuary), to burn incense (comp. the same words, Ex. xxx. 9), to wear the Ephod before Jehovah, and to attend to all the offerings made by fire (אשי—the proper expression of the Pentateuch) of the children of Israel.

After what has been remarked, it must at least be admitted without contradiction, that the Law of sacrifice appears here as completely formed, as it is presented to us in the Pentateuch, while it must at the same time certainly be observed, that in these books it is only extraordinary occasions, on which sacrifices were presented, that, from the nature of the case, are referred to; but these the more necessarily admit of our drawing a conclusion as to the common presentation of sacrifices and the administration of religious worship, in the mode prescribed by the Law. This also clearly shows the arbitrariness of the opinion held by those, who

think they discover in these books the greatest errors on these points in relation to the Mosaic Law. Thus it has been affirmed, that there are still to be found traces here of human sacrifices being offered as part of Jehovah's worship, and 2 Sam. xxi. has been adduced in evidence of it[1]—a strange sort of sacrifice (of which, in the first place, the narrative says not a word), in which seven men are *hanged up;* an act, besides, which is performed by the Gibeonites. The expression *before Jehovah* hardly admits of being referred to a sacrifice at least, which was presented to him, since it refers to the presence of the Tabernacle in Gibeah, and the narrator rightly gives prominence to the fact, that it was in sight of it that the punishment was executed on the descendants of Saul. Besides, the whole case is quite an extraordinary one, as is indicated by the narrative itself, xxi. 1, 2. But chief stress has been laid on the circumstance, that the kings here offer sacrifice in person,[2] as to which an appeal would hardly require to be made to the expression, that the king offered sacrifice, since that expression by no means denotes *the performance of sacrificial service* [der Opferdienst]; while the other marks that are adduced as indicative of the assumption of a priestly character by the kings, do not prove the point. For the Ephod was certainly by no means a priestly ornament in itself; it was only the Ephod proper to the High Priest, that could be worn by no other person—but where do we find the occurrence of such a thing mentioned? Nor, when it is said that David blessed the people (2 Sam. vi. 18), is it possible to see how in doing so he was guilty of a despotic intrusion into the functions of the priesthood, since every member of the Theocracy was certainly at liberty to do it. As to the king's offering sacrifice on the field, again, there is no want of express testimonies, that they had with them priests and the Ark of the Covenant: comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 18. The passage 2 Sam. viii. 18 has still less to do with the point; where David's sons are called כהנים; for there the signification of *Priests* is quite inadmissible.[3]

Instead of correcting here at still greater length this wanton criticism, we shall satisfy ourselves with pointing out some other traces that furnish positive testimonies to the existence at the time

1 See *e. g.* Gramberg, l. c. i. p. 114, ff. V. Bohlen, p. cx. Vatke, p. 355.

2 So Vatke also last, p. 311.

3 Comp. Keil, üb. d. chr. p. 346, ff. Movers, p. 301, ff.

of our book of the Law. In 1 Sam. xiv. 32, ff., we read of a violation of the prohibition of eating blood, which is considered by Saul as a sin against Jehovah. In 1 Sam. xxi. we find the Sanctuary in Nob, in the tribe of Benjamin. There is here likewise a high priest, Ahimelech, of the race of Eli. Here we meet with mention of the Shewbread (v. 7), which was regularly deposited and taken away according to the Law (Lev. xxiv. 8.). Here is the High Priest's Ephod, xxi. 10, which, being subsequently carried off hence and worn by the fugitive priest Abiathar, is enquired at by David as an oracle (xxiii. 9, xxx. 7.). Here there are eighty-five priests, whom Saul causes to be put to death (xxii. 18), and none of the Israelites dares to execute the bloody mandate of the king: it is only the Edomite Doeg, who is ready to lay his hand on the priests of Jehovah (xxii. 17)—an incidental testimony, but on that account the more important a testimony of the respect in which the priestly office was held. In xxviii. 6 it is said, that Saul sought counsel of Jehovah in vain, and that Jehovah gave him no answer, neither in dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. We have here a statement of the three different ways,[1] by which the Lord revealed himself to the people, which had its foundation in the Mosaic law, and existed in the Theocracy at all times. A difficulty indeed has been found in this, as it is said, Saul could not enquire of the Urim, since the High Priest who wore it was not present. But this difficulty is removed by observing, that at that time there were two Sanctuaries and two High Priests. The Ark of the Covenant too had constantly been carried about by Saul in his campaigns, and he could thus easily apply to the priest who waited upon it. David frequently enquires of Jehovah on important emergencies, 2 Sam. ii. 1, v. 19, ff., xxiii. In Hebron he makes a covenant with the elders *before Jehovah,* which shows that the Ark of the Covenant had been brought there.[2] According to 2 Sam. vi., the Ark of the Covenant is brought in solemn procession to

1 Comp. Gen. Introd. to Old Testament, § 11, where the agreement of this passage with the other writings of the Old Testament is pointed out.

2 That the expression לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, denotes the special manifestation of the divine majesty in the Tabernacle, and by means of the Ark of the Covenant, has been shown by Movers, l. c. p. 290. Other important passages in the books of Samuel, on this point, are 2 Sam. vii. 6, where Jehovah, speaking through Nathan, expressly calls the Tabernacle his dwelling-place; and 2 Sam. vi. 2, where the Ark is distinctly mentioned as the seat of the divine majesty, where Jehovah was invoked.

Jerusalem. On this occasion, Uzzah meets with sudden death, because of daring to touch the Ark, and David recognises in this event an admonition to cause the Ark to be carried, not driven, up to Jerusalem (v. 13.). From what source should the king have got the knowledge of this, or the priests, of whom he enquired respecting the occurrence according to the statement in Chronicles (1 Chron. xv.)? Certainly in the brief narrative given in the books of Samuel, the "bearers of the Ark" are not more precisely designated as Levites; but for no other reason but because every one knew, who were the persons that were charged with this duty. We have therefore no right to speak of that act of the transportation of the Ark as being "unpriestly and illegal:[1] the accordance with the Pentateuch, as to the *carrying* of the Ark, is here also plainly enough brought out, and no more was required to show the legality of the transaction. But certainly the narrative, which is so brief, receives its proper explanation only by having recourse to the Mosaic Law; it is quite unintelligible, if we put that out of view: that which forms the proper central point of the narration, the difference between the first unfortunate procession, and the second one, which succeeded prosperously, then remains, quite inexplicable as to its cause.

David erects a tent for the Ark of the Covenant, and has two priests, Zadok and Abiathar (vi. 17, viii. 17.). This account exactly agrees with the history, inasmuch as, after Eli's death, and the carrying away of the Ark by the Philistines, it never returned to the Tabernacle. Thus two High Priests were necessary. On this it appears needful to remark, that the two High Priests were descended from two different houses, the family of Eleazar and that of Ithamar, between which there may very likely have existed a relation of rivalry. This division of the sanctuary was certainly not according to the law, but it owed its introduction to the circumstances which had brought about such an urgent case; and in particular, the peculiar relations of the two priestly families, by which the one had possession of the dignity *de facto*, and the other *de jure*, must have contributed their share to it. But this condition of things can be explained only by supposing the previous existence of the unity of the sanctuary, and thence deducing the division, not *vice versa*.

[1] See De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 244, ff.

For otherwise why was not a new Ark constructed for the empty Tabernacle? Why did both the Tabernacle and the Ark, even when separate, remain quite in their ancient condition?

Ch. vii. contains a multitude of references to the Pentateuch. Vers. 21—24 are expressions taken almost verbally from the Pentateuch; comp. *e. g.* Deut. iv. 7, ff., xxi. 8. Even the words in ver. 19, וזאת תורת האדם, appear to involve such a reference; "this (to wit, the promise of God) is a law for men," *i. e.*, a firm, irreversible statute, as in the Pentateuch the formula זאת תורת הנזיר, &c., is so common.[1] In viii. 4 we have a fulfilment of the command Deut. xvii. 16, relating to the keeping of many horses by the king. In xii. 9 the prophet Nathan says to David—"wherefore hast thou despised *the word of Jehovah*, in that thou hast done what is evil in his sight"—likewise with a plain reference to the law.[2] In xi 4 there is an allusion to the law of purification from *concubitus*, Levit. xv.; and in xii. 6 a reference to Exod. xxii. 1. In xv. 7, ff. we read of a vow of Absalom's, which he paid in Hebron, and offered sacrifices on the occasion. This was certainly an illegal procedure; but, with regard to David's conduct in the matter, it is sufficiently explained by the inviolable character which the Law gave to a vow. In xv. 24, ff., we find the Ark borne and accompanied by the priests and Levites; a passage which also throws light on 2 Sam. vi. and is in harmony with 1 Sam. vi. In xix. 12, ff. we have the priests introduced, giving directions to the people, and admonishing them to fidelity to their rightful ruler; and the people obey their voice. In xxii. 23, David says: "all his judgments (*Rechte*, משפטיו) are before me; and as for his commandments (חקותיו), I did not depart from them," (Ps. xviii. 23) —where by a mode of expression derived from the usage of the Pentateuch, as frequently elsewhere,[3] the Mosaic legislation, and that too as a whole (כל), is denoted. In xxiv. 18, ff., David, at the divine command, builds an altar on the floor of Araunah, and there offers burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.

The book of Ruth also, that we may bring it likewise forward here, as belonging to the period which we have been reviewing, contains several references to the Pentateuch. Thus the statement

1 Comp. Schnurrer, Dissert. Philol. p. 263.

2 "*Verbum Jehovæ*, legem divinam, quæ adulterium et caedem vetat." Clericus.

3 Comp. Movers, üb. d. Chr. p. 272.

respecting Ruth's marriage presupposes the law of Levirate, Deut. xxv.; and the obligation mentioned in this book as incumbent on the relative, who was not the brother-in-law of the widow, to marry her, must have subsequently arisen out of that law.[1] Ruth iv. 11, 12, has a reference to Gen. xxix. 31, ff., xxxviii. 29.

What has been said supplies us with the following results as to the history of the Pentateuch :—1. In the first place, the books of Judges and Samuel suppose the previous existence of the Pentateuch; for the frequent verbal citations from it, and the express introduction of mention of the work, can be explained only by the fact, that the authors of these books were in possession of it as a written document. These books consequently form no exception in this respect to the rest of the sacred literature of the Hebrews. But the object of these books, as well as the nature of the subject they treat of, sufficiently explains the circumstance, that a reference to the Pentateuch is not of such frequent occurrence in them, as it is particularly in the books of Chronicles which were composed with another object.

2. Although the condition of the nation after Joshua's death was one of internal distraction, yet we find a multitude of relations so established, as admits of explanation only from the precedence of an age like the Mosaic, and from a fixed rule which had been handed down from that age. Were that supposition not sustained, the degeneracy of the people must have been quite different from what we find it to have been in the times of the Judges. An act so great in a moral respect, as the union of the tribes for the punishment of the crime of the Benjamites, supposes a high degree of ethical consciousness, which is explained only by such a fact, as the Mosaic legislation, viewed in its influence on the collective consciousness of the nation. It is only by a reference to the same fact, that we can remove the enigmatical character that would otherwise attach to the zeal of a Gideon, the hymn of a Deborah, and the reformation of a Samuel. Along with the normal condition there certainly occur irregularities, such as Samuel's mode of procedure, and the separation of the Ark from the sanctuary;—but they are quite justified by the extraordinary nature and urgency of the circumstances which occasion them; while their very occur-

[1] Comp. Benary, De Hebræorum leviratu, p. 19, sq.

rence appears explicable only from the precedence of a higher condition, and only brings us back at last to that which is legal. The idolatry of the nation, however, has its analogy even in the Mosaic age. As it appears there, as the opposing element to the Law, as the natural principle that is in opposition to the higher divine principle, so also it appears in the following age. But when we see a man like Samuel, able in such circumstances to succeed in bringing the whole of Israel to serve Jehovah alone (1 Sam. vii. 4); it supposes, both in him and in the people, such a knowledge of the normal condition of things, as shews that they knew the theoretical representation of that condition to be one that was properly founded and developed.

3. The view of the opponents of the genuineness rests upon the un-historical premise, which is in contradiction to the most express testimonies of our narratives, that until the time of David there was no national sanctuary in existence, nor was the ceremonial law observed.[1] All that is true in that supposition is, that the ceremonial law was applied in an imperfect manner. But the reason of this also lies in the nature of the Mosaic institutions themselves. The proper centre of the Mosaic establishment was the Tabernacle, the sanctuary and the revelation of the divine glory in it. This central-point was merely a provisional one: in its designation and form, it was adapted and intended only for the period of sojourn in the wilderness. For the time when the land should be occupied, there was appointed in the Law itself "the place which Jehovah should choose;" but the condition absolutely required for this, was the occupation of the land and its purification from all idolatry. The non-fulfilment of this condition through the sin of the people, gave rise likewise to a provisional and unusual state of the Theocracy,[2] until it was fulfilled, and the divine promise fulfilled along with it; which state of things again must objectively have had an injurious influence on the observance and general maintenance of the Law. Not till David's time, who expelled the Jebusites, was there a beginning made of a fulfilment of the divine command, and a way opened for the proper theocratic central-point of the nation (2 Sam. xxiv.); and by the building of the Temple the foundation

1 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 254, ff.

2 Hence it is said also in 1 Kings iii. 2, that the people sacrificed in the high places in the time of Solomon, because there was as yet no Temple built.

was laid of a better ordered state of things in the nation, in a moral and religious respect. Thus then it is clear, for instance, that the very celebration of the feasts, which were connected with a particular sanctuary, supposes special regulations of life in the Theocracy. It is true that here also we meet with feasts, in particular the observance of the New Moons, and probably also the feast of Tabernacles ;[1] but it is both probable in itself, and is also confirmed by express testimonies,[2] that this observance was very irregular and far from being exactly according to the arrangements of the Law. Thus the one thing here introduced the other, and they exercised a mutual influence on one another. The neglecting to effect the extirpation of the Canaanites prevented the complete severance of the Theocracy and Idolatry : the non-fulfilment from this cause of the Lord's purpose, to give the people a common fixed sanctuary, which was itself a consequence of the unfaithfulness and sin of Israel, brought out those evils again, and thus the state of the people in a theocratic respect, and of their position towards the Law, was constantly a provisional one.

4. The description which is given us of the condition of the people in the documents of the post-Mosaic period that relate to that subject, bears a reference throughout to the Pentateuch. The book of Judges, for instance, at once regards the aberration of the people as a forsaking of Jehovah and his commandments, and a turning aside after Baal, &c. The opponents lay stress upon the retrogradation,[3] that must have been made by the people in this period, as compared with the Mosaic ; going on the supposition, in the first place, that the whole of the Mosaic Law, in case it is really regarded as deserving that name, must be traced to the national spirit and life of that age, while these were just in opposition to the Law even in the time of Moses. In the next place, there is just as little attention paid to the return of the people to a better state, which took place under Samuel ; while this very fact supposes the existence of an objective rule, as a foundation for reformations of that kind. But what we have principally to remark, is, that the assertion of the opponents is in contradiction to the history of the post-

1 Comp. 1 Sam. xx. 5, 19. Judg. xx. 21. George, Jud. Feste, p. 150. That חג is used to denote this feast principally, is acknowledged also by Gesenius, Jes. i. p. 878.

2 See 2 Kings xxiii. 22 (2 Chron. xxxv. 18) ; Nehem. viii. 17.

3 Comp. Vatke, Bib. Th. i. p. 252, ff.

Mosaic period in general as delivered to us. This historical account also must be viewed, according to the admission of the opponents themselves, as pervaded by a Mosaic spirit, and—must have been disfigured. The attack therefore must be directed, not only against the author of the Pentateuch, but also against the authors of the Books of Judges and Samuel; but these were unable to conceive of their own times otherwise than as marked by a declension, as compared with the Mosaic age. And this very conclusion, to which that criticism is driven, involves its own destruction: it is compelled to declare war on all historical documents; it has not a single positive testimony to adduce in its own favour.[1]

§ 34. CONTINUATION. THE AGE OF SOLOMON ACCORDING TO THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

An important testimony to the existence of the Pentateuch is found in 1 Kings ii. 3, where David on his death-bed admonishes his son and successor "to keep Jehovah's statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies, as it is written in the Law of Moses." But here too the criticism of our opponents immediately comes forward with the assertion, that this passage proves nothing as to the Pentateuch; for, 1. "the discourse cannot be literally true, as appears also from ver. 4, where the stamp of a later age is found in the tone of sympathy with Messianic expectations." But as relates to the late Messianic expectations, not only is that a mere supposition, but ver. 4 also refers to 2 Sam. vii., and cannot therefore be assailed on critical grounds. On the other hand, De Wette himself declares, vers. 5—9, and therefore the greater portion of the discourse to be "not the work of invention;" as indeed it cannot well be otherwise, considering the historical re-

1 This admission is brought out by Vatke in a particularly naïve manner. "It cannot be enough lamented (says he, p. 390), *that tradition has preserved to us no literary work, written from the standing-point of the worship of Nature.*" Then the excuse that is adduced for this, is, that "the spirit of the times subsequent to the Exile was not favourable to the preservation of such works." But that being the case, we have then no authentic annals at all, and the criticism of the opponents of the genuineness has no sort of objective justification, grounded on documents.

2 Comp. particularly De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 159, ff.

ference in ii. 29, ff.[1] Thus the only part of the discourse that would remain charged with being invented, would be ver. 3. But ver. 3 is not less closely connected with ver. 4, than ver. 4 is with ver. 5, so that the whole discourse, from its structure, does not admit of such a violent division. Such a procedure is also opposed by the character for faithfulness in the use of his sources, which the author of the book otherwise has; and in the case of so important a discourse, as that here, we cannot reconcile it with the character of "even the most honest historian," as De Wette thinks we may, "to embellish a little." In short, the reasoning referred to, amounts to the uncritical remark, that that verse must be spurious, because it contains a citation of the Pentateuch.

2. But it is also said, that the citation itself does not so much as prove that the whole of the Pentateuch is intended: De Wette maintains, that we may understand by the expressions here, merely the foundation of the Law, the Ten Commandments. This argument is contradictory of the first. For if ver. 3 is the work of the collector of the Pentateuch, as De Wette will have it, then there can be no doubt that by these appellations he meant the Pentateuch itself, for this very reason, that it is under those different appellations that the Pentateuch communicates its laws and institutions, and thus it is that it designates itself.[2] And so David also did, if he delivered this discourse to Solomon. Otherwise the repeated designations given to the *Law* would be inexplicable. The author intends by these to designate every thing then extant of that kind, in fact that *whole* [or *totality*], which was then known by the definite name תורת משה. Consequently, it cannot be shown that these refer to any thing else than our Pentateuch, and proof to that effect would require to be adduced by our opponents; since we know only *one* such book, to which that appellation would be applicable. 3. Finally, the remark is also made, that until the time of David no trace of our Pentateuch can be pointed out as an existing work. But apart from the untenableness of this opinion, as already demonstrated, we have a testimony which is a most convincing confutation of it, in the passage 2 Sam. xxii. 23, adduced in § 33 where David introduces the Law *in a manner perfectly analagous*. Now modern criticism has not ventured to impugn the genuine-

1. See also Bertholdt, Einl. p. 762.

2 Comp. *e. g.* Gen. xxvi. 5; Deut. v. 28, viii. 11.

ness of that Davidic song,[1] and thus has tied its own hands as to the present passage. So the one testimony here affords the most conspicuous confirmation of the other.

But in the course of this history also, there is no lack of allusions to the Pentateuch, which agree exactly with the passage just quoted. In ch. vi. 12, God appears to Solomon and promises him, to perform his word in reference to the new Temple, "if thou wilt walk in my statutes (חקותי), and execute my judgments (משפטי), and keep all my commandments" (כל-מצותי). The analogy of the expressions allows us here to think only of what the author had previously named as "the Law of Moses." In ch. viii. 9 mention is made of the Ark of the Covenant; and, with a manifest reference to the Pentateuch, the author remarks that there was nothing in it but the tables of stone, which Moses delivered to the people at Horeb (comp. Gen Introd. § 6). What led him, however, to make this remark? Evidently to point out the identity of this Ark with the Mosaic one, as the most essential part of the whole ritual. For it is just in this way that he also describes in vers. 10, 11, the revelation of the divine glory in the same words as occur in Exod. xl. 34, 35, with a manifest allusion to that passage. But shall we suppose that he was ignorant, that the Law was deposited before the Ark? He certainly gives too good evidence of his acquaintance with the Law, to charge him with such ignorance. But is this at all the place, where we must expect, as a matter of inevitable necessity, that mention should be made of the Torah? By no means; for all that the writer has chiefly to do with, is the description of the divine glory, which was connected with the Ark, not with the Torah. And why may not the Torah be understood as included among all the "holy vessels" which were brought out of the old Tabernacle into the new Temple (viii. 4.)?[2] But whether that was the case or not, we may certainly regard the *argumentum a silentio* as being here particularly unfortunate. The whole preceding description of the Temple, however,

1 Comp. *e. g.* De Wette, Psalms, p. 179, 4th German edition. Hitzig, on the Psalms, ii. p. 21, ff. Ewald, Psalms, p. 52, ff., et al.

2 This indeed is disputed by De Wette, i. p. 166, but only on the ground that כלי הקדש denotes articles for sacred use; but was not the object for which Moses deposited the Law in that place, a sacred use of it? Was not the Law appointed for the sacred purpose of delivering a testimony in honour of God before all the people, and either for or against them?

presupposes that of the Tabernacle in the Pentateuch;[1] for it is only thus that we can explain what is defective in the delineation, as well as its peculiarity, since it manifestly gives prominence to what was new and diverse in the Temple of Solomon, as compared with the Tabernacle. But we have also still more definite and express references to the Pentateuch. In ch. viii. 12 Solomon declares, that "the Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness." This is a clear citation of God's expressions in the Pentateuch, in which he declares the fact of his dwelling in the cloud; comp. particularly Exod. xx. 18; Levit. xvi. 2. Solomon, in his speech to the people, considers the Temple as the place for the Ark of the Covenant, "wherein is the Covenant of the Lord, which he made with our Fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt" (viii. 21, comp. Exod. xxi. 13; xxv. 16.). He describes the object of the Temple, which was the expiation of the sins of each individual as well as of the nation, quite in the words of the Pentateuch; comp. viii. 31, ff., with Lev. v. 1, ff.; xxvi. 17; Deut. xxviii. 25; xi. 17, et al. In short, the whole of this discourse is to be read and to be explained only with the constant aid of the Pentateuch; even as the king expressly appeals to it, "as thou spakest by the hand of Moses thy servant," viii. 53, comp. Ex. xix. 5. There has not failed one word of all the precious words which the Lord spake by his servant Moses—it is said viii. 56; and even as faith in the divine *promises* of the Pentateuch here receives confirmation, so does the same king also give an impressive admonition to abide by the *statutes* of Jehovah, and to keep his *commandments* (viii. 61.). In short, it requires the greatest degree of blindness not to recognize the fact, that this discourse presupposes the existence of the Pentateuch, as much as the book of Joshua and the Chronicles do.

The author, in seeking to give an account of the origin of Solomon's idolatry, knew not how he could do it in another or a better way, than by going back directly to the Law, and tracing the king's idolatrous conduct to his violation of the prohibition of marriages with the Canaanitish women (xi. 2, ff.). This circumstance, however, has also another important bearing on the Pentateuch. It shews in the case of an individual what we so frequently see realized

[1] As even Gramberg, Gesch. d. Rel. Id. i. p. 60, is obliged to acknowledge.

in the history of the nation, and which is here of particular importance with reference to the relation of the period of the Judges to the preceding period; namely, the quick transition from the worship of Jehovah to an apostacy from him. We are indeed able in this case to perceive also, even in the previous life and character of Solomon, the traces of such an inclination; and to note the concurrence of several circumstances, such as his love of pomp, his striving after external splendour, and so forth, which form the point of connection with the actual apostacy into which he subsequently fell. But the same thing is also true of the history of Israel as a whole; and as that history constantly exhibits the incitement to apostacy, springing from external things, so in it, as well as in Solomon's case, we shall succeed in combining all that is required for a true understanding of the history, only by having recourse to the internal aspect of the matter,—the *natural* lust of the mind, which is directed, not to Jehovah, but to that which lies away from him, —and from that point of view apprehending the whole as effect and counter-effect.[1]

References to the Law in matters of *fact* are not wanting in this period. We hardly require to advert to the sacrifices which are here constantly designated according to the Mosaic mode. We shall mention only the *feasts*. In 1 Kings viii. 2, the feast that was kept on the occasion of the dedication of the Temple, is spoken of; it is called "the feast of the seventh month," subsequently simply "the feast" (חג, viii. 65); and we are thus necessarily led, especially considering the mention of its being kept for seven days, to regard it as the feast of Tabernacles, which fell in that month, and was kept just so many days. Even if the Chronicler did not expressly indicate as much (2 Chron. vii. 8, ff.), we should necessarily adopt that view.[2] But how comes it that the author

1 In connection with this it deserves attention also, that the idolatry which Solomon permitted his wives to practise appears to have been quite undefined, and not to have received any kind of limited form from him. "Thus he did for *all his foreign wives*"—it is said 1 Kings xi. 8. This then necessarily supposes a certain religious view, which was connected syncretistically with these different kinds of worship, and endeavoured to harmonise them with itself; and hence leads to the conclusion of a proper idolatry in Solomon's own case. So much at the same time in confutation of Vatke, p. 361, ff.

2 Comp. Movers, l. cit. p. 223. Even George admits, that the author of the book of Kings certainly held the view that it was the feast of Tabernacles; but to get out of the dilemma, he declares the את, viii. 2, to be—not genuine (l. cit. pp. 156, 157.). This, however, is of little advantage him; for then viii. 65 must also be spurious.

here throughout says nothing of any kind of new institution by Solomon, and that he presupposes that his readers are quite well acquainted with the feast? The presupposition that is here made can decide only in favour of the Pentateuch. In ch. ix. 25, it is said that Solomon kept great sacrificial feasts three times in the year. This was natural, for so the Law commanded, Ex. xxiii. 17. Here too the author could not have expressed himself so, had it not been that every member of the Theocracy knew, or might know, that the reference here was to the three principal feasts.[1]

Thus, even looking merely at that one of our historical sources, which has not for the subject of its representation at all religious worship and the inward theocratic life; it can be satisfactorily shewn that the Pentateuch existed in the age of Solomon.

§ 35. TESTIMONIES TO THE PENTATEUCH FROM THE PERIOD SUBSEQUENT TO SOLOMON.

While, in the age of David and Solomon, we meet with a newly awakened life in the Theocracy, which had been produced by Samuel's reforms, developing itself and advancing vigorously under the pious government of David,—a government that adhered with exclusive strictness to the service of Jehovah,—and finding in the Temple of Solomon its principal outward point of support; yet even already under Solomon, the transition to a more corrupt condition must have had the way prepared for it by his syncretistic courses. Already in his time we observe that pliability, that false universalist tendency, which, while it tolerates falsehood and sin, is disposed to forgive the truth nothing, and thus identifies it with the former. Since political views and the love of external show were perhaps the primary occasions of marriage with foreign women, it cannot be said that there was exactly involved in that an inclination to idolatry, but only a violation of the Law, in practising which one may perhaps have thought to avoid the consequence indicated by the Law, namely the worship of false gods (Deut. vii. 3,

[1] Even George admits that there is here a manifest reference observable to the three great feasts, prescribed in Deuteronomy (p. 159.). But he represents the matter as if Solomon had *instituted* this religious observance. For the first time, does he mean? That can hardly be shewn from the text.

4), but was driven, however, by this first step, and the carnal security accompanying it, to that consequence. But what we here find only in the bud, comes out with far greater strength after Solomon's time. The greater part of the people then lose the Temple, the centre of their religious worship. The division of the nation into two kingdoms, which was itself the consequence of sin, gives rise on its part to new sins.

It is an interesting question, what relation the new kingdom of Israel now held to the national worship, and what was its religious theocratic position in reference to the kingdom of Judah. As, even in Solomon's time, the syncretistic tendency which we remarked supposes a certain prevalent religious consciousness,[1] and an objective rule, which the subjective consciousness endeavoured to equalize and bring into harmony with foreign elements; it is all the more the case in the present instance, since the difficulty encountered in constituting the kingdom of Israël a theocratic state, almost inevitably led to that endeavour. The new institutions of Jeroboam the First (1 Kings xii. 25, ff.) are of the greatest importance in reference to this question. This king rebuilds Sichem and Penuel, and raises the former city to the rank of his residence. What can have been his motive for conferring distinction in this way just at once on those cities? The history of the Pentateuch shows us a multitude of sacred reminiscences which were connected with them. These at once make Jeroboam's procedure perfectly intelligible to us. That such was the true motive, is still more plainly seen from what follows. The people had been accustomed to go to Jerusalem to present their sacrifices in the house of the Lord; but the king considers these journeys as favourable to the dominion of the house of David,[2] and on that account seeks to prevent them. He erects two golden calves at Bethel and Dan. The very choice of the former of these places—(the second was chosen, perhaps, because of the disloyal worship of God, which had been established there in the times of the Judges, Judg. xviii.)—and still more, the words he employs, 1 Kings xii. 28, which exactly agree with those of Aaron, Ex. xxxii. 4; as well as the whole

1 [By *consciousness* here and elsewhere is meant, a class of views and feelings.—Tr.]

2 In the same way as the Caliph Valid Abdulmelek regarded the pilgrimages to Mecca as tending to injure the dynasty of the Ommiades, and on that account sought to encourage the pilgrimage to Jerusalem: Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. pp. 10, 11, Köhler.

mode of the formation and institution of that worship, evidence a careful endeavour after a connection with the Pentateuch.[1] The king evidently sought by this appeal to the example of Aaron to free the innovation from the appearance of being such, and therefore to restore that figurative representation of Jehovah under the symbol of the religion of Nature, which had been set up before in the wilderness. Jeroboam's residence in Egypt, which has been commonly given as the reason of this measure, is not sufficient to account for it; as it does not explain how the expedient adopted met with such an accordant reception from the people (1 Kings xii. 30.). We might suppose that something else would have had a much more imposing effect upon them; but the old custom, with the appeal to the expression of the first High Priest, was indisputably the most effective means, powerfully to strengthen the inclination, for which even Solomon's time had proved preparative, to bring down the worship of Jehovah to the same level with that of heathen religions. Jeroboam regards as necessary, not only a sanctuary, but also priests expressly appointed to their office; and as the tribe of Levi had forsaken the kingdom of Israel, he saw himself compelled to nominate others (vers. 31, 32, xiii. 33.). Here we are also necessitated to explain the conduct of the Levites, the surrender of their whole existence, and their taking no part in Jeroboam's system of worship, solely from the influence of the Pentateuch, and the recognition of it as a Law of inviolable sacredness. It may be said, indeed, that the preceding period still exerted this beneficial influence, as a subsequent effect; but this can never be proposed as being the chief or only cause, since that age showed itself to be in no sort the epoch of original appointment and regulation, but only of restoration. Besides, were we to regard mere usage or introduced custom, as the principle which guided and determined the Levites on this occasion, it would be impossible to explain how such a motive, when it came into the most decided conflict with their own interest, controlled that feeling in so general a manner; a far more powerful lever, and a more decisive authority was demanded for that. Neither is it possible in this way to account for Jeroboam's conduct, in his adherence to the worship of Jehovah, and the peculiar kind of form that he gave to it. Since the king

1 Comp. Bochart, Hieroz. i. p. 367, sq.

must have thought it to be a matter of the utmost importance, to effect as decided a separation of Israel from Judah as possible, one cannot see why he should not have at once broken in pieces the burdensome fetters; while, on the contrary, he expressly acknowledges the legal propriety of going to Jerusalem to present sacrifices, and is manifestly puzzled as to how he should give, not merely this custom, but this *command*, a turn more favourable to his own interest (1 Kings xii. 27, 28.). Farther, an institution also of Jeroboam's speaks in support of this. He instituted "a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the same, *like to the feast which was in Judah*," (ver. 32.). The king must then have had a reason for regarding the celebration of the feast in Judah, as forming a rule for his own feast,[1] and for only venturing to order the slight alteration with reference to the time of the observance of the feast of Tabernacles; for which the circumstance, that in the northern part of Palestine the harvest is later than in the southern districts, might furnish a welcome pretext. "Eo consilio omnia, ut substantiam quidem et corpus quasi religionis commune cum Judæis Israelitæ retinerent, ne nimiâ novatione animi turbarentur; in circumstantiis tamen notabilis esset diversitas, quæ utriusque regni populos, quod optandum Jeroboamo erat, magis magisque a se invicem alienaret."[2]

Although the institutions of Jeroboam thus deviate from those of the Pentateuch, and stand in opposition to it, yet they are proofs of the existence of the original, just because they form the caricature of it. Had it been possible to overthrow the binding force and authority of the Pentateuch, this was certainly a period that was quite adapted to effect that; but an adherence to it was the only support that the apostate kingdom could gain for itself. The rulers of Israel knew this so well, that they all, with the easily explained exception of Ahab and his family, held fast by this support, though

1 As here lies that point of the history, that is most decisive as to the Pentateuch, it is to no purpose for George, l. cit. p. 160, to lay stress on the notion, that it was only in the opinion of the narrator that the alteration was an illegal proceeding.

2 Witsius, Ægyptiaca, p. 316. That the Pentateuch was followed in other parts likewise of the religious worship of the kingdom of Israel, and that the attempt was made to accommodate one's self to it, at least as far as possible, is shown also by such passages as 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings iii. 20, iv. 23, which prove the presentation of the daily sacrifice, and the observance of the Sabbath, and of the New Moons. Even under the reign of an Ahab, the law is adduced (Lev. xxiv. 10, ff.), by which blasphemy was punished with stoning, 1 Kings xxi. 13.

transformed and modelled indeed after their own fashion. How can it be explained that the zeal of a Jehu, when destroying the worship of Baal, was directed unsparingly against the adherents of that idolatry, but yet at the same time retained Jeroboam's system of worship (2 Kings x. 29, 31.)? He discerned what was injurious, on both sides: on the one side, the declension of the popular mind into a purely heathen element, and their consequently ceasing to be Jehovah's covenant-people; but on the other hand, according to the views of *that* policy, every true and decisive reform must have appeared detrimental to the continued independent existence of the kingdom of Israel. There remained therefore only the perverted middle way, by which, avoiding both disadvantages, one believed himself sure of the advantage of being the covenant-people, Jehovah's peculiar possession, though not in the sense of that strictness which marked the ancient legislation, but in a way which reconciled things wholly opposed to one another. To halt between two opinions, and to commingle Jehovah and Baal—the method adopted in all similar periods, was that which human perversity followed on this occasion too. What expedient was hit upon throughout to give a fair appearance to this procedure, we have not been informed: Scripture represents this evasion also of the divine commands, according to its plain and simple meaning, as being an apostacy from them and their author. It is undeniable, however, that this procedure presupposes the acknowledgment and the possession of the Pentateuch: the abuse here bears witness to the existence of the Law. It is only if one will dare, in contempt of all historical truth, to maintain the gross assertion, that "in general the spirit of older times was preserved in Israel, which even in the age of David formed the prevalent state of feeling;"[2] it is only on that view, we say, that no retrogression can be affirmed, as compared with that past period; and then it follows, that the view taken by all the Hebrew historians is pervaded by the grossest spirit of falsehood. Whoever, from aversion to such distortions of history, goes here into an unprejudiced examination of the matter, will not fail to remark the obvious disappearance of a better antecedent age in Israel; for, being once drawn into the way of destruction, it

1 Comp. 1 Kings xviii. 21; Hos. ii. 16. Hengstenberg, Christol. 3, p. 8, ff.

2 Vatke, l. c. p. 393.

is urged onwards without stop to the abyss of ruin. But if such a declension is manifestly to be acknowledged, then, where a halt is thus made half way, the restraining principle must be pointed out, which throughout so long a period prevented a complete apostacy, and produced in some measure a balance; while it even gave rise to energetic attempts at reformation in the midst of this career, and hindered it from assuming a more decided character.

If now in addition to these considerations we also take into account the fact, that even in the times of Elijah a considerable number of such men still remained in the nation, who took no part in idolatry, and that too at a time when certainly there were connected with such a participation, not less important external advantages than in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes (comp. 1 Kings xix. 18); we are led to adopt the conclusion of a like ground of explanation for this fidelity to Jehovah. But in connection with this, the agency of the *Prophets* in the kingdom of Israel comes particularly under consideration. As matters stood there, they must necessarily have been able to appeal for themselves to an objective right, and it must have been by a legal appointment that they enjoyed such an authority, as left no man at liberty to make any opposition to their burning zeal, but made him feel weak and powerless against it. Yet none of those apostate rulers dared to lay hands on these men of God, except when the purely heathen element had gained so decided a preponderance, as in Ahab's reign! And yet their number was so considerable, that it may justly be said, that what this kingdom had lost as to priests and lawful worship, must have been supplied through divine Providence by Prophets, so that the name of the Lord should not be completely forgotten, nor a testimony be wanting in honour of Him.[1] Thus they at once come forward, at the institution of the new mode of worship, in opposition to it, and call down a woe on Jeroboam and his deeds (1 Kings xiii. 1, ff.). Their

1 This also shews the right which Elijah had to offer the sacrifice, of which we have an account in 1 Kings xviii.: an act which has frequently been regarded as anti-Mosaic. For apart from the fact, that what is there mentioned has properly nothing at all to do with any of the sacrifices prescribed in the Law of Moses, as the transaction is quite a peculiar and uncommon one; it must also be remembered that there were no lawful priests left in the kingdom of Israel to perform the sacred rite. Thus here at any rate was a case of necessity, in which Elijah had certainly a far greater right to shew for himself, than those unlawful priests. On the other hand, in 1 Kings xix. 21, there is no sacrifice spoken of at all, and nothing but want of understanding would lead one to think of such a thing there. (Gramberg, Gesch. d. R. Id. i. p. 149.)

dignity is so great, that Jehu, when anointed by them, is immediately acknowledged as the rightful king of Israel (2 Kings ix.). But we have the most special positive proofs of the introduction and recognition of the Pentateuch in the kingdom of Israel, in those *discourses* of the prophets of this country which have been preserved to us. The prophet Ahijah, under Jeroboam the First, testifies that because the king had not obeyed the *commandments of Jehovah*, he should fall into misfortune (comp. 1 Kings xiv. 8, ff., where there is a plain allusion to Deut. vi. 5.). So Elijah also says to Ahab, that he has forsaken the *commandments of Jehovah* and gone after Baalim (1 Kings xviii. 18.). Thus the prophets themselves point out to us the rule, according to which they fearlessly rebuked the sins of their contemporaries, and justified their rigorous conduct. This appears still more plainly from the discourses of Hosea and Amos, who are of particular importance here as prophets of Israel, since their longer discourses present us with a more complete picture of the labours of the prophets and their objective foundation (vid. on that subject § 36.).

If we turn now to the kingdom of Judah, we shall find there another condition of things, which will also lead us, however, to the same conclusion. It need not surprise us, that we should here discover at once the traces and subsequent effects, in a religious respect, of the reign of Solomon still remaining. The foreign influence still continues (1 Kings xiv. 21, ff.), and along with that also the introduction of heathen customs, especially of the voluptuous rites of anterior-Asia, the removal of which by Asa first favours the renewed development of a better life (xv. 13.).

It is a remarkable circumstance here, that all the kings of Judah, even those who were most theocratically disposed, failed to go farther in the extirpation of idolatry, than the destruction of the worship of idols and images, while the high places still remained. Hezekiah was the first who succeeded in putting an end to these also. This circumstance deserves a more particular examination. The first thing in it that surprises us is, that such sacred high places did indeed exist in the period before the building of the Temple as well, but were not then regarded as objects connected with idolatry, or even leading to it. On the contrary, this mode of worship appears at that time to have been as widely spread as it was innoxious.[1]

1 Comp. *e. g.*, 1 Sam. ix. 16; 2 Sam. xv. 32; 1 Kings iii. 2

This condition is sufficiently explained by the general exigency which prevailed at that time with regard to the Sanctuary. So long as the Tabernacle was a moveable sanctuary, and the Ark of the Covenant, and the sacred tent, were separated from each other, while every national assembly was held, either by conveying the former to it, or by meeting before the latter; the offering of sacrifices, &c., could be performed only at different places, which must in that way have received, especially when they were Levitical cities, a character of peculiar sacredness in the eyes of the people. Now although the institution regarding the unity of the Sanctuary, commanded in the Law and only deferred, had done away with that provisional state of things; yet the mind of the people had become too much accustomed to it, remembrance was too closely linked with those sacred places of antiquity, and the strict enforcement of the new institution in its entire consistency was too much at variance with the convenience and interest of many, to make it possible to resolve on an entire abolition of that earlier mode which the Sanctuary had superseded. It is therefore quite false, what moderns have often repeated, and Gesenius[1] agrees in asserting, that the choice, consecration, and importance of those national sanctuaries appear to reach back to a period, and to have been established, when the worship of Jehovah and Polytheism as yet existed together. This cannot at all be thought of as having been the case in the period of Samuel. On the contrary, those places were originally consecrated to the worship of Jehovah exclusively; but the Law prohibited them, as they threatened great danger to strict Monotheism (because they were prejudicial to the idea of the living God, as revealing himself in a certain concrete unity); and as, especially because of the similar custom of the neighbouring heathen nations,[2] they were easily turned aside to an idolatrous use, as was also actually the case in later times. Hence, after the erection of the Temple, that strict view of the case which was founded on the Law required to be introduced altogether, and we find it everywhere prevailing in the books of Kings.

While there was then this essential distinction between the worship of the high places, and that image worship which was practised in the kingdom of Israel; we must also regard the attempts at re-

1 Preface to Gramberg's Gesch. d. Rel. Id. i., p. xvii.
2 Vid. Gesenius, l. c. p. xv. Thes. L. Heb. i., p. 188.

formation, undertaken by pious kings, even when they were not successful in abolishing the irregularity referred to, as still giving the kingdom of Judah a great pre-eminence above its related neighbour-state. But we may here affirm even more than this. It is quite a false assertion,[1] that the religious worship connected with the high places *was not held to be wrong*. The contrary is shown by the efforts of Asa, Jehoshaphat, and Joash, all of whom had the intention of remedying the evil, but were not able to carry that intention into effect.[2] Now this circumstance cannot be explained, without admitting the existence of the Levitical Law, which strictly prohibited the high places (Lev. xxvi. 30, Deut. xii.). An ancient hallowed custom, which in appearance at least was sanctioned by the consideration due to distinguished men of God, and which besides must have been so closely accordant with *natural* views and feelings, as this was; could be assailed, or abolished, only by such a preponderating authority, as irresistibly demolished all doubts and subterfuges.

But there are other facts also by which we can show that the Pentateuch was in existence in this period. We refer in the first place to the reign of Joash, which is particularly deserving of note in this respect. Everything here appears mainly pervaded by the Levitical spirit, and inexplicable apart from the existence of a Mosaic code. The priests are *instructors*, even instructors of the king (2 Kings xii. 3); the Levites keep watch and ward at the Sanctuary (xi. 6, xii. 10.).[3] The Sabbath is mentioned, and in such a way, that the exact observance of the law respecting it may be recognized; for the plan of enthroning the young king is carried into effect on that day, when such a thing was least expected, and opportunity was given for precautions.[4] Ch. xii. 5 pre-supposes the laws respecting the revenues of the priests (כסף חקדשים), in a way remarkably accordant with the Pentateuch. That money, to wit, is here classified in a threefold manner.[5] First, as *the money of those who were numbered* in the census, according

[1] See De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 256.

[2] Comp. Keil, üb. d Chronik, p. 290,

[3] Comp. Keil, l. c. p. 365, ff.

[4] Gramberg, l. c. i. p. 303, draws indeed an opposite conclusion from the passage; with the same justice as one might perchance deduce the same from 1 Macc. ix. 43, ff.

[5] So the passage is correctly understood by Abarbanel, Vatablus, and other older expositors.

to Ex. xxx. 12, ff.[1] Next, as the money of the valuation of every soul, according to Levit. xxvii. with which also the expression exactly agrees. Lastly, as free-will gifts; a circumstance which is so far of importance as it supposes that the interest felt in the Temple, the worship, and the priests, was by no means cool and inconsiderable. In xii. 17 mention is made, not only of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, but there is also a special statement of the money to be given for them,[2] which was to go to the priests.—But ch. xi. 12 comes principally under consideration here. The High Priest, it is said, delivered to the young king the diadem and העדות. There is here an unmistakeable reference to the Law in Deut. xvii. 18—20. But the question is proposed, what it was that, according to that Law, was to be delivered to the king. The connection in Deuteronomy shews, that it is the *whole Pentateuch* that is spoken of. For, in the first place, the preceding law relating to the king is not spoken of as a proper Torah[3] (תורה אחת, as Ex. xii. 49); secondly, the words, "he shall read in it all the days of his life," evidently point to a larger work, which is also indicated by the expressions, "all the words of this Law, and these statutes" (comp. Deut. xxviii. 58), as well as by the circumstance that the Torah of the king should be a copy of the book which the Levites had (על ספר). Then too the expression העדות, *the* (well-known) *testimony*, is plain; for the Law in general was designated as ע״י יהוה, Ps. xix. 8. That the Pentateuch is here intended, is made still more plain by the sequel of the narrative. The covenant-relation which the Priest had here re-

1 This money was so much the more required, as it was precisely what was appointed to be given to the building of the Sanctuary, according to the Mosaic institution, Ex. xxx. 16. With this 2 Chron. xxiv. 9 also exactly agrees. Comp. J. D. Michaelis, De Censibus Heb. § 2.—The explanation is quite false, and also philologically inadmissible, by which כסף עיבר is rendered, "*current-money*," which must necessarily be expressed עיבר לסחר, Gen. xxiii. 16; for the passages Cant. v. 5, 13 do not relate to this. But, on the other hand, the expression עיבר here is quite intelligible from the context, and because of the law, which is pre-supposed as known.

2 Mention is made of this in Lev. v. 16. Amends had to be made for the harm that had been done in the holy thing, and the fifth part had to be added to it; which belonged to the priest. On the other hand, Lev. v. 15 is of doubtful interpretation, see Clericus in loc. Gramberg, however (l. c. p. 151), has so little knowledge of the former passage, that he concludes from the present passage, that the sin and trespass-offerings were at that time only money offerings, not offerings in cattle—and he then calls that *non-Mosaic!*

3 Comp. respecting this usus loquendi, Herbst, l. cit. p. 29, sq.

newed between Jehovah, the king, and the people, ver. 17, ff., has a manifest reference to the first covenant-relation, as established by Moses, Exod. xix. and xxiv., and the words להיות לעם ליהוה expressly point to it (comp. Deut. iv. 20, xxvii. 9.). From this it is likewise seen how; on all occasions when the distress of the times and the influence of the better class of the nation made themselves felt, the people in returning to the Lord knew no other ground for so doing than that of the divine Law.[1] The difficulty in which our opponents find themselves is, finally, the best testimony here that can be given to the sole admissibility of our opinion.[2]

In 2 Kings xiv. 6, it is said of Amaziah that he did not put the children of those who murdered his father to death, according to the enactment of the Law, Deut. xxiv. 16. This is commonly said to be the narrator's individual view, which he has here introduced.[3] But it is hardly possible to make out an exegetical justification of that opinion; for the text clearly enough attributes this motive to the king himself. But it may be justified perhaps by the custom of the narrator, as proved by other instances. For one thing, however, the narrator follows his ancient authorities with great fidelity; and for another, it is not his habit to cite the book of the Law so frequently as to give ground for that suspicion. But how stands it with the fact as considered in itself? It is a general Oriental custom to subject the families of criminals to the same punishment as the criminals themselves.[4] Here then we ask, how the king, against all custom, came to perform an act which Gramberg calls a surprising one? (ii. p. 176.). When the matter is regarded in this aspect, the motive which is attributed to him by our historian, manifestly appears the simplest and most natural. That the laws relating to leprosy (comp. Levit. xiii.; Num. v. 1, ff., xii. 14, ff.) were observed, is shewn by the passages

1 In spite of that, Vatke, p. 409, asserts that in this case the laws of the Pentateuch exerted no influence, so that the Pentateuch cannot be intended.

2 Thus Vatke thinks that we should perhaps read עדות, *Royal ornament*, but that would require to be עדי, comp. Böttcher, Proben, p. 132. De Wette says, Einl. p. 207 (4te Ausg.—in the earlier editions otherwise!), "the עדות may (sic!) be the contract of election mentioned in ver. 17, or *an older Law-book incorporated in the Pentateuch*." According to Gramberg (ii. p. 175) the reference is to the Law of the kingdom as given by Samuel, &c. What arbitrariness!

3 Comp. *e g.* De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 167.

4 Comp. instances in the author's Commentary on Daniel, p. 224.

2 Kings vii. 3, xv. 5. A very important reference to the Pentateuch is contained in xviii. 4, where an account is given of the total destruction of every thing connected with idolatry by Hezekiah, and mention is made at the same time of the brazen serpent (comp. § 28), with respect to which Hezekiah removed the idolatrous abuse into which the people had fallen. This fact has a particular interest, inasmuch as it shews, how the pure Mosaic belief had become darkened and mingled with foreign elements in the popular conceptions of that period; while these also here pre-suppose the former, and the more necessarily as the king would hardly have dared suddenly to remove a custom which had been confirmed by length of time, if he had not been able to adduce an authority, before which every thing else must give way; so that this one instance serves as a conspicuous confirmation of the opinion, that Hezekiah bound himself strictly by the prescriptions of the Pentateuch (xviii. 6.).

Our opponents lay particular stress upon the idolatry of Ahaz: the compliance of the priest Urijah especially (2 Kings xvi.) is regarded as very scandalous.[1] It may be so, but his conduct is not by any means inexplicable on that account, and affords no ground for calling in question the recognition of the authority of the Mosaic Law, or the fact of its existence at that period. Or shall we say that examples of a similar falsely compliant course of conduct towards kings are really so rare, that even the strictest law must not in such a case be put to shame? Besides Ahaz had previously distinguished this priest as his favourite,[2] which explains his pliability so much the better. In addition, we must by no means think of Ahaz as being, so far as externals went, a prince that completely abandoned Jehovah, but only that the anti-theocratic element gained a predominant influence over his conduct.[3] Then, however, a pretext will all the less have been wanting to the priest, to enable him to give such a fair colour to his proceedings as to deceive himself and others. Even the example of Solomon, in his employment of foreign artificers in the building of the Temple, &c., might be used in justification of these measures. Besides the very passage xvi. 15 also supposes a very exact observance of the cere-

[1] De Wette, Beitr. i., p. 253.
[2] Comp. Gesenius, Comment. on Isaiah vii. 2.
[3] Comp. Hitzig, Comment. on Isaiah, p. 83.

monial law up to this time, and consequently does away with all doubt in reference to the book of the Law.

The passage 2 Kings xxii., however, on which so much has been said, still deserves most attention. The question here is, whether it is in accordance with our conclusions so far, or not. Two inferences are drawn by the criticism of the opponents from the finding of the book of the Law in Josiah's reign by the priest Hilkiah: the one is, that up to this time that book was unknown; and the other, that the book which was discovered was not in fact our Pentateuch in its present form.

The first assertion is propounded with great confidence. "The whole narrative loses its force if this was not the *first* occasion of the appearance of the book of the Law." (George, p. 14.). De Wette, proceeding on the uncritical rejection of all the testimonies to an earlier existence of the Pentateuch, has come to the conclusion, which all the recent critics of this school have subscribed after him, that "in the discovery of the book of the Law in the Temple, which made a great noise, *the first certain trace of the existence of a Mosaic book*" is to be found.[1] But the following considerations speak most decidedly against this. (*a.*) The very words, "I have found *the book of the Law*," (ver. 8), clearly show the contrary. How could the High Priest use these words in delivering the book to Shaphan, supposing the latter knew nothing at all of it? Both individuals, on the contrary, are so well acquainted with it that it only requires to be designated by this its known name for one to know what it is.[2] It is a very strange conclusion to say: "Since it is *found*, and that, too, as a *book* (*i.e.* as to its contents), *it could not have been there before.*" (De Wette, p. 170). What logic! Does De Wette, perchance, use the word *find* in the sense of *invent*? When something known is found, it is found again, or discovered, and מצא may signify this as well as בנה, *to build*, may be used for *to rebuild, build up again*; or נתן, *dare*, for *reddere*, &c. Indeed, the language has no other word for this idea. Our opponents, therefore, must evidently bring in here an

[1] Beitr. i., p. 168, ff. Einl. § 161.

[2] De Wette's argumentation rests on the wholly ungrammatical translation *a book* of the Law. Hence the words he uses, "If, however, he had said, I have found the book of the Law, (which we have missed so long)" p. 178. In his translation of the Bible (sec. ed.), the same learned writer has, however, given the correct translation,—"*the book of the Law.*"

additional idea, of which the text says nothing; the book is a supposititious invention, the matter looks not unlike "a concerted scheme," &c., (De Wette, p. 179,);[1] and, "I have found the book of the Law," is consequently a mere euphemism for, "I have forged the book." An exegesis which bids such defiance to all the rules of sound hermeneutics is indeed undeserving of any farther refutation. (*b.*) The conduct of the king and of the court is inexplicable, supposing they now for the first time heard news of this book. We find no sign in the narrative of mistrust or astonishment on their part at the existence of such a book. Would the king have been seized with such terror, when he heard the words of this book; would he immediately have adopted such energetic measures, if he had not recognised it at once as authentic? Farther, the narrative says not a word of the king's astonishment respecting the existence of the book, but only respecting its contents, and the long non-observance of the Law, and the refractory opposition shown to it (vers. 11—13.). When he complains that their *fathers* had not acted according to it, it is evident that he must have been convinced that the Law was known and accessible to them.[2] It would also assuredly be a decidedly false conclusion to infer a *general* non-acquaintance with the Pentateuch, from the circumstance of the king's betraying an ignorance of its contents. In such a court as must have existed during the long reign of Manasseh, does not such an ignorance appear quite probable, and admit of being so explained? But the opposite of this conclusion may be proved convincingly from the narrative itself. The king sends a message to the prophetess Huldah, and makes inquiry of her respecting the book and its declarations. She then at once confirms the truth of those words by a prophetic declaration, and evidently knows the book that is spoken of, for she says: "*all the words of this book*, wherein the king hath read, shall be fulfilled." Hence the prophetess Huldah also must have had a share in the "concerted scheme." But we meet here with a fresh confirmation of our own view. Not only does this prophetess give confirmation to the book that has been

1 See also Bleek, in the Repert. p. 60, ff. Hartmann, p. 570. V. Bohlen, p. clxiv. &c.

2 Hence Vatke also, p. 508, is obliged to suppose, that the narrative is defective here, that there are middle terms wanting, &c. This supposition, however, is quite arbitrary in a narrative that is so detailed, and that gives a perfectly complete picture of the occurrence.

discovered, but it is also read out of in presence of the priests, the prophets, and the whole people (xxiii. 2.). What a conjoint plot must this concerted scheme have been! Who are the persons deceived here; since all appear to have nothing else in view than to deceive? The relation between the priests and prophets in that age was not exactly of the kind that will allow us to imagine such a combination (comp. *e. g.* Jerem. viii. 8), in which both parties joined hands in favour of falsehood, which the prophets on other occasions so unsparingly expose and rebuke. (*d.*) We must accordingly suppose that in the time of Josiah, even according to our narrative, the book of the Law was by no means generally unknown, and that it is only the king in particular that betrays an ignorance of its contents, without showing however a total ignorance of the existence of the book. This circumstance rises to still greater certainty, when we consider that, even before the finding of that book, the king had made reforms with regard to the idolatry, which had prevailed to a great extent.[1] Even De Wette says: "He appears to have been religious even before the discovery of the book of the Law, for he attends to the repairing of the Temple; the books of Kings also characterise him at the very commencement as a king of genuine Davidic piety (xxii. 2)." (p. 172.). The inference also is quite correct which he deduces from this observation: "It may thus perhaps be thought that he might have known the book of the Law, if it already existed." Josiah does know that there is a book of the Law, and he is partially acquainted, probably by tradition, with the matter of its contents; as is shewn by his obeying its commandments. But now by a remarkable occurrence, the discovery of the Temple-copy, his knowledge of it is not only made complete, but a powerful impression is also produced on his heart: it now becomes the purpose of his life to live as far as possible according to such a Law in its entire extent. In this way the whole history of the occurrence and the life of the king stand in perfect accordance with each other.

But, apart also from all these arguments, if we only consider the matter more seriously for a moment, as it appears when viewed in itself, the inadmissibility of the hypothesis advanced by the opponents of the genuineness, is clearly exhibited. A book, which penetrates so deeply into the whole life of the nation, impressing on

[1] Comp. the evidence for this in Movers, ibid. p. 384, ff.

it the most peculiar character; which comes forward with the most direct opposition to an age sunken in idolatry, and unsparingly denounces a woe against it; which is promulgated at a time, when the prophets even (as Jeremiah) were exposed to the mockery of frivolous contemporaries, from whom both Law and Prophecy alike could reckon little on receiving recognition;—this book is said to make its appearance suddenly, being a deceptive fabrication of the priests, announcing to the people their punishment, and producing the deepest impression upon them, without any one raising the cry of deceit and falsehood, without a voice being raised against it, when it appears to be the interest of all to detect and expose the falseness of the book, and the deception which had been practised with it! Yet there was nothing more simple and easy than the adduction of proof in such a case, which besides could not but reckon on the accordance and sympathy of numbers! It is not so, however:—the pious in Judah may again rejoice that Jehovah's Law is honoured, and the mouth of the impious is shut, so that he must involuntarily contribute to that glorification; which shews the presence of an authority, which could be silenced by nothing, the appearance of which puts all complaints to shame, and which, in the very midst of all its enemies, celebrates its surest and noblest triumphs.

The opponents also are very sensible of this, and not satisfied with the assertion which has been already rejected as groundless, they also stand upon the diversity of that book from the Pentateuch in its present form. The very chaos of their views which constantly contradict one another, is evidence of the arbitrary nature of this opinion. Thus De Wette (p. 175) understands by the book that was found, Deuteronomy; Gramberg (i. p. 306), Exodus; Vater (p. 585) and Von Bohlen (p. clx.), a short abridgment of the laws, or at most Deuteronomy; Hartmann (p. 566), combined passages and sections from the four last books of the Pentateuch; Vatke (p. 505), the substance of the older legislation, which we have, a little altered; in the second book, and which is given in the fifth in a revised form, &c. The fact of the re-discovery of the Law must here evidently serve as the substratum of the various hypotheses, which every one has constructed, in a more or less arbitrary manner, respecting the origin of the Pentateuch. A supposition, however, that is common to them all, is the frag-

mentary nature of our work. With the assumption of the contrary of this last view, the whole of that representation also falls back into its own nothingness. This too is recognised by the more able of the opponents themselves. That Deuteronomy is here included in the reference, is too evident from the mention of the matter of the contents, ever to have been questioned. As that book, however—says Bleek, l. c. p. 59—certainly never existed as a separate composition, we cannot well adopt any other opinion, than that the book discovered was our Pentateuch.

That the book, farther, is plainly designated as the Pentateuch is clear from the name ספר התורה, xxii. 8, which appellation the whole Pentateuch receives even in Deuteronomy, as it does also in the later writers (comp. Ezra vii. 6; Nehem. viii. 3); and that of ספר הברית xxiii. 2, comp. Sirac. xxiv. 22, 1 Macc. i. 57. Now Israel knew of but *one* such book, that justly bore that name. But in xxiii. 25 also it is expressly the *whole* Law of Moses that is spoken of as being obeyed by Josiah, so that every doubt as to this point must vanish. But how difficult is it also to harmonize the view held by the opponents, with the statements of the narrative respecting the *contents* of the book! The book contained curses on the transgressors of the Law, just as we read them in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, and there occurs even a *verbal* reference to the latter, (comp. xxii. 17, with Deut. xxxi. 29.). But where punishments of that kind are proclaimed, the Law itself will not be wanting. But the book also really contained the history of a Covenant made with the nation, for this Covenant is renewed by Josiah on the ground of that book (xxiii. 3); and a multitude of ordinances (*ibid.*). Farther, it contained prohibitions of all kinds of idolatry, service on the high places, &c., which the king abolished; and his procedure in this matter (xxiii. 4, ff.) is only an imitation of that of Moses with respect to the idolatry in the wilderness (Ex. xxxii.). It contained laws relating to the Passover, the celebration of which is then regulated according to them; others relating to the unity of the Sanctuary (xxiii. 8), and to the priests (xxiii. 9.).[1] Can more

1 Here it is said that the priests of the high places did not come up to the Sanctuary, "but they ate of the unleavened bread among their brethren." Compare thereon Clericus:—"inter emolumenta sacerdotalia erant azymi panes, seu placentae azymæ, de quibus Lev. ii. 4, 5, 11. Sed sub hoc nomine contineri etiam videntur reliqui omnes sacerdotii fructus, sine quibus vitam tolerare non potuissent. Hi sacerdotes, illicitis hostiis im-

evidences as to its contents be required than these, for us to decide that it must necessarily be our Pentateuch that is intended? For were we even to confine the contents to those portions that are expressly mentioned, it would by no means serve the purpose, as they again are of such a nature that they necessarily pre-suppose a larger work. But so arbitrary a limitation would also be opposed to all the rules of sound criticism.

The copy found in the Temple was beyond dispute the *Temple-copy*. It is quite a useless question, whether it was the autograph of Moses, or a later transcription instead of it; for even in the latter case it should be regarded as being as good as the autograph, with as much justice as we should say that the Temple when repaired by Josiah, still remained Solomon's Temple.[1] Now that such a copy was in existence, has already been shown elsewhere from other grounds (Gen. Introd. § 6, p. 17, ff. of the original); and our opponents' view is founded solely on the passage that is presumed to be contradictory to this, 1 Kings viii. 9 (comp. De Wette, p. 178.). It is also manifest how easily such a copy might remain unobserved, especially as it did not lie in the Ark itself, and be neglected; how easily even, under such priests, (who, to please the kings, favoured rather than hindered idolatrous practices), especially under Josiah's immediate predecessors, the obnoxious testimony of Jehovah against his people might be intentionally put aside; as, on the other hand, it is manifest that just such a copy as this must also have made a remarkable impression, when it was found. The only thing concerning which we are left in the dark by the history that is specially occupied with the sequel of this occurrence, is the way and manner in which the copy had been lost. This circumstance, however, is so little essential, and may so easily and naturally be explained from the preceding accounts,—those of the practices of Manasseh in particular (ch. xxi.)—that any unprejudiced writer might suitably enough pass it over. But on that account it is also inadmissible, to attempt to settle how long that copy had been missing or unknown; and the main point of the

purati, habiti sunt veluti immundi, et instar eorum qui vitio aliquo corporis laborabant, quos vetuerat Moses accedere ad offerendum cibum Dei sui, Levit. xxi. 17, 21, sed quibus tamen fas erat, cibum Dei sui ex sacrosanctis aut sacris comedere."

1 Hence the objection of that copy's having been damaged by age, &c. (V. Bohlen, p. clxii.) should never have been made.

whole narrative must still be regarded as this, that a particularly remarkable copy of the book of the Law was found in the Temple, the discovery and reading of which produced an exceedingly beneficial impression on the king and the nation, because it was recognised by all as a sacred obligatory book, and as the Mosaic Law.

The critical conclusion from this passage, accordingly, is no other than that it serves to prove, equally with a multitude of passages already considered, the previous existence of the Law, and a more general acquaintance with it.

§ 36. CONCLUDING REMARKS REGARDING THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

We have purposely excluded the books of Chronicles from our examination thus far: we have been willing to make this subtraction, because there exists with respect to them on the part of our later critics, a false supposition regarding the difference between them and the other books, as well as an admission as to these books themselves. As to the supposed difference, our opponents have here too already retraced their steps. When Von Bohlen admits, that "the books of Kings shown a knowledge of the written Law in its entire extent" (p. cliv.), this is denying any difference between them and the Chronicles with reference to the Pentateuch. Hence we must regard it as only an inconsiderate self-contradiction, when we find the same critic elsewhere expressing himself, as if the confirmation of the opinion of the previous existence of the Pentateuch depended solely on the testimonies in Chronicles. When the admission, however, is made, that the books of Chronicles assume throughout, in their statements, the existence of the Pentateuch, and cannot be understood without that being supposed; it is done only in conjunction with the remark, that the credibility of these books is very much to be suspected. But this suspicion again has for its first and chiefest pre-supposition—the non-authenticity of the Pentateuch.[1] Thus the reasoning of our opponents here revolves incessantly in a circle, and is therefore destitute of any firm foundation.

From our comparison thus far of the historical books it has ap-

1 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 5. On the other side, Keil, ibid. p. 262, ff.

peared, not only that they are all composed in a spirit like that of the Pentateuch, censuring or commending whatever it characterises in the one way or the other,[1] but also that they contain a very considerable proportional number of traces in matters of fact of the existence of that legal basis of the Theocracy. The demand made by our opponents, particularly when viewed in reference to this, must appear just as preposterous as their assertions which have been quoted, in denial of the existence of those traces. What caution the critic would require to exercise in inquiries of this sort, having regard in every instance to the object and plan of each work, in order to draw such bold conclusions from them, may be shown, for instance, by a comparison of the book of Esther; the composition of which belongs indisputably to an age, in which even the boldest scepticism must allow that the Pentateuch existed. If we were to draw conclusions from that book, and from the fact that it *appears* not to be acquainted with so much as the name *Jehovah*, in the same way as the fashionable criticism has done from the book of Judges, &c.; how should we mistake! But the Pentateuch itself appears as forming with the books that treat of the subsequent history an inseparable whole, no individual part of which must be regarded as forming an exception; and it would be a difficult matter to break through this strong bulwark, did not the criticism of the moderns often act with as much wantonness and self-illusion as scepticism.

With the historical writings of the canon already considered, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which take up again the history subsequent to the captivity, are closely connected. Here also we find not only frequent citations of the Pentateuch,[2] but also sure traces of its existence in its present form; compare especially Nehem. ix. "After the exile—says De Wette, Einl. p. 208—the whole political and ecclesiastical life of the Jews is founded on the Mosaic book of the Law, and the mention of our present Pentateuch is as certain as it is frequent. Ezra is the first who is called a scribe[3] well acquainted with the Law of Moses (Ezr. vii. 6.)." The incorrectness of the last assertion will appear from the fol-

1 See Jahn, Einl. ii. p. 40.

2 Com. *e. g.* Ezra iii. 2, vi. 18. Nehem. viii. 14, x. 36, et al. See De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 180, ff.

3 De Wette's expression is—"Ein Gelehrter"—*a learned man*, for which I have substituted the more familiar term.

lowing section. Here we shall only add the remark that even these testimonies, which are so surely established, have also, notwithstanding, been exposed to suspicion from criticism. And how could it well have been otherwise, when the force of the evidence which lies in these testimonies was clearly presented to the mind? What gave rise to that remarkable change which we see in the people on their return from the captivity, so that they now embrace altogether this one political and religious system; so that, far from going aside after those foreign peculiarities, of which, however, they had gained a sufficiently thorough knowledge, they only preserve their own still more firmly, and at once turn to the Law as their only and highest refuge, binding themselves firmly to it? These are phenomena, indeed, which we cannot explain without admitting not only the existence of the Pentateuch, but also the general acknowledgment of it as a sacred book and an unassailable authority. "Quæ loca," says Rosenmüller, Prolegg., p. 10, "etsi in iis libris exstent, quæ plurimis post Mosen seculis sunt scripti, tamen hoc probant, fuisse ista ætate, id est sexto a. Ch. n. sec. libros, e quibus leges, promissiones et minæ—afferuntur, communi gentis Hebrææ judicio pro talibus habitos, qui a Mose essent conscripti. Jam vero si cogitaveris, tale judicium non paucorum quorundam hominum opinione formari sed niti debere eo, quod majoribus acceptum per plures ætates propagatum esset, loca illa—argumentum neutiquam leve Mosaicæ Pent. originis præbent." How comes it also that, while in *such* times and amidst such distracted circumstances the individual commonly asserts his preponderance above the mass with the most successful issue, here the very persons, who are men of distinction, feel, without exception, so deep a concern in nothing as in going back to that higher authority, and re-organising everything in the new state according to it? Evidently, because this was the *firmest ground* on which they could stand, and of which they had gained a knowledge.

But one would persuade us that even here "the influence of the Pentateuch is exhibited for the first time, in its origin," and for this reason that prescriptions are now first *found* in it (Neh. viii. 14, ff., xiii. 1, ff.), and the conclusion is thought to be obvious, if this fact is combined with others, that "a *general* sanction of it came about only gradually *even up to the time of Christ*."[1] This is the

1 Von Bohlen, p. clv. Comp. Herbst, l. cit., p. 59, sq.

purport of the monstrous issue to which this reckless criticism is resolved to come; and that the case *must* stand so, if its premises held good, who could deny? But could it really be the *origin* of its influence that is here for the first time spoken of, when the first Jewish colony, immediately after their arrival in Palestine, present their sacrifices and celebrate the feast of Tabernacles "as it is written in the Law of Moses the man of God". (Ezr. iii. 2)? And for that purpose no additional special means and arts were required to gain this mode an entrance among the people, as must necessarily have been the case, supposing the opposite assertion were true: on the contrary, their participation in it is as general as it is cordial, of which we do not know a more vivid picture than that which is presented to us in the book of Ezra itself (iii. 12, 13.). But certainly the exile was a period in which the Law with its sacred usages could be fulfilled only in the most imperfect manner; none but the elders had seen the glory of Solomon's Temple, and retained a lively remembrance of it; circumstances which formed a very intelligible occasion for *searching* the Law, in order to follow it faithfully in all its parts. But when there is such searching, there is also *finding*, and the passages that mention this testify accordingly only to the zeal and fidelity with which the Mosaic Law was followed. But when we see every effort put forth to make the Law accessible to the people; when we see every advantage so decidedly traced solely to an adherence to this Law, and every calamity to the abandonment of it (Neh. ix.); we cannot possibly speak of a gradual influence or sanction of the Law, for we should then be obliged to understand by the terms something quite different from what they are commonly used to signify.

§ 37. TESTIMONIES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH IN THE PROPHETS.

We shall now give, from the other writings of the Old Testament, facts supplementary to the conclusion which we have thus far deduced from the historical books. As the prophetic literature stands first in connection, as to the time of its origin, with the period subsequent to Solomon, it exhibits in another point of view, owing to its peculiar character, the extent of the book of the Law, known to

those writers, and its contents, so that in these respects *our* Pentateuch is proved to be the same as theirs. This enquiry has at the same time a particular interest, with regard to certain assertions of our opponents. "It awakens a very injurious prejudice against the genuineness of our Pentateuch (says De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 183, ff.), that the Prophets, whom we take as infallible witnesses as to the age and its character, both because of the historical certainty of their age (for they are the only writers of the Old Testament (??) whose age can be fixed, and that too by the surest marks, namely their internal character), and also particularly because of their character, which was free from all prejudices, candid, and unconstrained by positive fetters, as they appear isolated, without a party and against every party, simply as witnesses of the truth, contending particularly against the hierarchy;—that the Prophets, I say, do not speak at all of the Mosaic book of the Law, do not recommend it, do not use it to authenticate their instructions. They constantly introduce the Law in their discourse, but not the book of the Law. If it did indeed exist, it must have been of little account with them and their contemporaries." Hence we see what great weight is attributed to these testimonies; and as they must consistently, upon the grounds that have been assigned, continue to retain this in the eyes of the critics, even supposing a closer examination should conduct us to a different conclusion as to the bearing of the evidence, it is the more worth the trouble to make that examination. Our opponents, however, are certainly very confident as to their discovery. Von Bohlen, agreeing with De Wette, expresses his decision thus, p. clii: "They (the Prophets) never inculcate a precept with the words of the Pentateuch (sic!), by which they might have considerably heightened the effect of their rebukes, as the Moslem moral preachers do by the words of the Koran; and the argumentum a silentio is here so cogent, that it may at once be established as an axiom, that *these older prophets knew not* the Pentateuch." George, l. c. p. 15, says: "The prophets are acquainted with the historical mythi of the Pentateuch [so that here is *one* admission!], and not unfrequently make mention of them. But they never exhibit an acquaintance with the divine book of the Law; they never appeal to it, as we should necessarily expect, had such a work been in existence; it is always only the divine voice in themselves that they give forth."

In commencing the refutation of such views with the earliest prophets, it is necessary to remark that Hosea and Amos, citizens of the kingdom of Israel and sent to it, are not only particularly fitted to introduce us to the internal condition of that kingdom, but also supply the most striking proofs of the introduction and authority of the Pentateuch in it. We shall make a beginning with some of the chief passages of the prophet HOSEA. In an address to the rebellious priesthood he says: "thou rejectest the knowledge (of God, iv. 1), and I will reject thee from my priesthood; and as thou forgettest the *Law of thy God*, so will I also forget thy children," iv. 6. This passage supposes that the obligation lay principally on the priesthood, to occupy their attention with the Law; hence their greatest offence here is called a forgetting of the Law, the contempt of it, chiefly in a practical respect. The sin of the people is represented in vi. 7 as the *violation of a covenant*, and what the Prophet understands by that is shewn by viii. 1: "they transgress my *covenant* and they trespass against my *Law*." The central point of the Law, and of this book of the covenant, could not be more suitably referred to than as it is here. But that the Prophet understands a *written* Law, he states likewise in viii. 12: "I *write* to them the multitude[1] of my laws, they are counted as a strange thing."

But references to the Pentateuch are of such frequency in Hosea, that we adduce only the most important, among which there are found many so close as to the *words*, that we can explain them only by supposing that he used a written copy of the Pentateuch. At the same time all the books of the Pentateuch without exception are here equally made use of. In ch. ii. 2, 17 the Prophet refers to Ex. i. 10 and Deut. xvii. 15; in ii. 10 to Deut. vii. 13, xi. 14.[2] In ch. ii. 19 the law in Ex. xxiii. 13 is cited just as in Zechar. xiii. 2. Ch. iii. 1 contains verbal reminiscences from

[1] רִבּוֹ, according to the reading of the text, which is not to be altered, *a great multitude*, a myriad, as רִבָבָה elsewhere. The Prophet regards the prophets as the men who continued the divine Law, maintained its living influence in the mind (vi. 5, comp. 2 Kings xvii. 13; Ezr. ix. 11); hence the second modus of the verb is employed, אכתוב, comp. Ewald, Gr. § 264. b. Sec. German ed. Hartmann must have paid very little attention to the passages adduced in the text, where he says, p. 575, that from this important passage we may at least conclude, that at that time there were *many written collections of laws* in existence. The Prophet manifestly knows but *one* such collection.

[2] Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. iii. pp. 59, 80, ff.

Deut. vii. 8, xxxi. 18; as iv. 10 does, from Lev. xxvi. 26 (comp. Micah vi. 14), as the words, ולא יפרצו, are completely explained only by attending to the threatening in Lev. xx. 20, 21. The difficult expression, כמריבי בהן (iv. 4), "as they that strive with the priest," can be explained only by an allusion to the law in Deut. xvii. 12, according to which the Prophet makes the people themselves decide their own punishment as there denoted, and the passage has light thrown upon it by the custom of this Prophet; compare v. 10, "the princes of Judah are like them that remove boundaries," in which regard is had to the Law in Deut. xix. 14; xxvii. 17. Sacrifices are frequently mentioned, and in such a way that it is evident that there was no defect as to the number of them, and the external observance of the Law, but rather as to right internal feeling. Almost all kinds of sacrifices appear here, as the Mosaic Law designates them; Burnt-offerings (vi. 6), Drink-offerings and slain sacrifices (ix. 3, 4), Peace-offerings (xiv. 3), Sin-offerings and Trespass-offerings (iv. 8).[1] Feasts are named in ii. 13 (E. V. ver. 11), and particularly the Sabbath, the New-Moon and the festive assemblies,[2] comp. v. 6. Ch. xii. 10 (E. V. ver. 9) relates to the feast of Tabernacles, and its observance in memory of the sojourn in the wilderness.

In ch. viii. 6 the Prophet announces the like fate for the calf of Samaria, as befel the same object of idolatry in the wilderness, with an evident reference to Exod. xxxii. 20; Deut. ix. 21.[3] The prohibition of unclean meats is touched on in ix. 3. An almost verbal allusion to Deut. xxvi. 14 occurs in ix. 4. In ix. 10, we have, "I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness (referring to Deut. xxxii. 10—but they went after Baal-peor, and consecrated themselves to the idol" (ויזרו לבשת comp. Num. xxv. 3, ויצמד ישראל לבעל.[4] These references are particularly frequent from ch. xi. onwards, where the Prophet, looking back upon

[1] Comp. also in reference to the last, the use of אשם, v. 15, just as in Lev. iv. 13, v. 5, et. al.

[2] Comp. on that Hengstenberg, l. c. p. 85, ff.

[3] The difficult word שבירים is perhaps most probably to be rendered by *Fuel, material for burning*, for the Arabic root شبب signifies *to burn* (Ibn. Doreid, vers. 130. Schultens, Animadvv. ad. h. l. exc. Ham. p. 380, sq.), and hence שביב (Job, xviii. 5) *a flame*. The sense consequently is, it should be burnt.

[4] The expression יזרו is purposely selected, so as to point expressly at the same time to the law of the Nazarite in Num. vi.

the early history of his nation, compares it with the present. Thus xi. 1 is derived from Ex. iv. 22; xi. 4 alludes to the miraculous feeding of the people; xi. 8, to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen. xix. In xii. 4, 5, the Prophet represents Jacob's history as an example to the people, as to how they should turn to God, and what they might obtain from him. The reference to these narratives of Genesis is, according to the Prophet's manner, so brief and merely allusive, that it supposes, both in him and in his readers, a very exact acquaintance with them. Proof is supplied also that the Prophet had a written document before him, by such expressions borrowed from the Pentateuch as עקב, שרה. In ver. 13 also he comes back again to the same history. The commencement of the Decalogue is in current use with the Prophet as a form of introduction: comp. xii. 10, xiii. 4. In xii. 12 there is an allusion to Genes. xxxi. 46, 47. Moses is spoken of as a *Prophet*, who led the people out of Egypt, and preserved them, xii. 14; with a reference to the passages, where the Pentateuch itself thus designates Moses, Num. xii. 6, ff.; Deut. xviii. 18, ff. Ch. xiii. 6, adverts to the sojourn in the wilderness, and the divine benefits conferred there.

In the same way Amos has regard to the Pentateuch; and it has been justly said, that in his case such a knowledge is the more surprising, as he was of inferior condition, and not even educated in the schools of the prophets (vii. 14.)[1] Amos also denounces against Judah the destruction that should overtake it, because of rejecting *the Law of Jehovah and his statutes*, ii. 4. In ch. ii. 8, he makes reference to the requirement to restore a deposited pledge before evening (Ex. xxii. 26; Deut. xxiv. 12, 13.) The expression ענושים also is one derived from the Law, Ex. xxi. 22; Deut. xxii. 19. Ch. ii. 9, refers to Num. xiii. 32, 33. The author appears also to be acquainted with no other primitive nations of Canaan than the Amorites, whom he puts for them all here, using the appellation after the manner of the Pentateuch, in the more general sense (comp. Gen. xv. 16; Deut. i. 20.). With ch. ii. 10 compare Deut. xxviii. 4. Ch. ii. 11, 12, supposes the existence of the law of the Nazarite[2] (Num. vi.), and refers likewise to Deut.

1 Comp. Liter. Anz. of Tholuck, 1833. Nr. 40, p. 313, ff.

2 I cannot, however, recognize here an allusion to Gen. xix. 32, 34 (see Lit. Anz. *ibid.*, p. 314.).

xviii. 5. Ch. iii. 2 has reference to such passages as Ex. xix. 5, Deut. xiv. 2. In ch. iv. 4, morning sacrifices are spoken of (Num. xxviii. 3), and the tithe which was to be paid every three years (Deut. xiv. 28, xxvi. 12.). Thus both these ordinances of Moses were observed in the kingdom of Israel also. Ch. iv. 5 has to do with the prohibition in Levit. vii. 12, 13, of offering leavened bread along with the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and at the same time the freewill offerings (נדבות, Lev. xxii. 18, ff.; Deut. xii. 6) are mentioned. In ch. iv. 9, 10, the punishments which should befal Israel are described quite according to the threatenings of the Pentateuch. "I smite you בשדפון וביקון," stands exactly thus also in Deut. xxviii. 22, as what follows refers to Deut. xxviii. 38, ff., which cannot by any chance be regarded as accidental. "I send among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt," is derived from Lev. xxvi. 25; Deut. xxviii. 27 (בשחין מצרים)[1]: on what follows compare Lev. xxvi. 25.—Ch. iv. 11 refers to Gen. xix. and Deut. iv. 11, from which last the very expression is borrowed. In v. 6 Jehovah is compared to a consuming fire, probably in imitation of Deut. iv. 24. In v. 8 there occurs an allusion to the Deluge. The feasts and solemn assemblies (עצרות), the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and peace-offerings, are mentioned in v. 21, 22. In v. 25, 26, the Canaanitish idolatry, with which the people were infected even in the wilderness, is touched upon. The Prophet had been indignant with those who thought to allay the anger of Jehovah by an external fulfilment of the Law. In order to give them a striking example that this could not be done, that Jehovah was to be satisfied not by works, but solely by internal conversion and righteousness (vers. 6, 14, 24), he appeals to the state of the nation in the wilderness. "Did ye (he says), serve *me* there exclusively during the forty years, in the manner prescribed?" (Thus the passage pre-supposes the institution of the ceremonial Law in the wilderness.). "On the contrary, even at that time, ye practised the idolatry of Canaan (Num. xxv.) *even as now*." That this latter reference is necessarily to be retained in the text, appears from what immediately follows: "*I lead you* into captivity," &c. (ver. 27.). That a constant idolatry is spoken of here, cannot be shown from the text at all: on the contrary, the addition, "during

[1] Hence the reference to Exod. ix. (Lit. Anz. ibid. p. 316, where this passage in general is not correctly understood), is more remote.

the forty years," must just mean, "Ye did not serve me faithfully throughout the whole time; and therefore ye shall likewise meet with chastisement as your fathers did then." Compare also section 24. In ch. vi. 1, the expression ראשית הגוים is borrowed from Num. xxiv. 20. In ix. 3 allusion is made to Num. xxi. 6; in ix. 8 to Deut. vi. 15. In ix. 13 the promise, Lev. xxvi. 3–5, is again taken up.

What we have in this way found to be the case with the prophets of the kingdom of Israel, we may even before hand expect to meet with in those of Judah likewise. Yet here too it may be well to show by some particularly striking examples, how customary are these allusions and references to the Pentateuch. We shall select JOEL first, whose prophecy, from its age, as well as its small extent, supplies a particularly convincing proof of the assertion. Even the entire subject of his discourse, the representation of a power that should devastate Israel[1] [?] under the figure of locusts, rests here, as in Amos, on those expressions of the Pentateuch which threaten the Israelites with such plagues. The commencement of his prophecy also reminds us vividly of Deut. xxxii.–i. 7. In what honour the Prophet holds the ceremonial Law, is shown by its being represented as a principal punishment for Judah, that the sacrifices can no longer be presented, and that the priesthood, Jehovah's servants, must mourn (i. 9.).—In i. 10 he says also in reference to that, that the supplies of corn, wine, and oil, the first fruits of which belonged to Jehovah, should cease, with an evident reference to Deut. xxviii. 51.[2]—Hence he calls upon the priests to put on mourning apparel and lament, "for the meat-offering and the drink-offering is withholden from the house of your God" (i. 13.). In all these passages with the following context, the existence of a splendid Levitical ritual is presupposed: the reference to the laws of sacrifice and worship contained in Joel is of a decisive character.—Ch. ii. 2 is verbally derived from Exod. x. 14. The Prophet makes an application of the plague, there described as befalling Egypt, to that which was now to befal the rebellious covenant-people.[3]—Ch. ii. 3, "the land is as the garden of Eden before

[1] [Is this not a mistake for *Judah?* or possibly the author here uses the name as a *general* appellation.]

[2] Comp. Credner, Comment. on Joel. p. 128, ff.

[3] Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. 3, p. 158. On the other hand, Credner, p. 173, and Von Bohlen, p. lvi., suppose that we have in Exodus an imitation of the passage in Joel.

them and behind them a desolate wilderness," refers to Gen. xiii. 10. The Prophet compares the state of his own country to the fate of the vale of Siddim.—Ch. ii. 13 is a citation, introduced with כי, from Ex. xxxiv. 6, xxxii. 14.[1]—Ch. ii. 17 refers to Deut. xv. 6. The passage ii. 23 stands in a particularly remarkable connection with Deut. xi. 13, 14, as does the passage iii. 8 with Deut. vi. 22, and alludes to the miracles in Egypt in general.

Not less numerous are the instances of reference to the Pentateuch which occur in MICAH. Ch. i. 7 points to the Law, Deut. xxiii. 19, by which the hire of a harlot was not to be brought into the Temple.—Ch. v. 5 (E. V. ver. 6) Babylon is called "the land of Nimrod," with a reference to Gen. x. 10.—Ch. v. 6 (E. V. ver. 7) the words כרביבים עלי עשב are a reminiscence from Deut. xxxii. 2.—Ch. vi. 4, "For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of bondage (Deut. vii. 21); and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam," refers to the events of Exodus. In ch. vi. 5 mention is made of the history of Balaam, and the people are admonished to remember him; a requirement that would have been absurd, supposing written documents respecting the matter had not existed. In the same place allusion is made to the occurrence in Num. xxv., which is thus the most exact citation of our Pentateuch which can be imagined. In vi. 6 it is said, "Shall I come before Jehovah with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old?" comp. Levit. ii. 1, 15, ix. 2, 3. In vi. 14, 15 we have threatenings that are simply extracted from the Pentateuch. In particular, comp. Deut. xxviii. 39, יין לא תשתה, and xxviii. 40, ושמן לא תסוך (where the use of the verb סוך is also quite peculiar.).—Ch. vii. 15 has reference to the miracles in Egypt.—Ch. vii. 17, refers to the Fall, Gen. iii. 14.—In ch. vii. 20 the covenant-relation, into which God entered with the patriarchs, is alluded to, as it existed in the early times of the nation.

ISAIAH frequently makes reference to the historical events of the Pentateuch; indeed so frequently that it must be numbered amongst the peculiarities of that prophet, as the liberation from

[1] Here too Von Bohlen, p. cliii., consistently represents the Pentateuch as imitating Joel. At the same time the remark of Hartmann, p. 575, deserves correction here, when he says that definite citations from the Pentateuch are not to be found in that prophet.

[2] Comp. Hengstenberg, ibid. p. 160, 170, 180, ff.

Egypt, for instance, is introduced by him with extraordinary frequency, with the mention of many individual circumstances.[1] That the Prophet is equally acquainted with the Law is shown by such adductions as i. 11, 13, xxx. 29 (where the passover is mentioned) et al. We shall bring forward besides only some *verbal* citations from the Pentateuch. Ch. iii. 9 refers to Gen. xix. 5, on which Hitzig correctly says: this reference shows, that Isaiah had the narrative Gen. xix. before him in writing. In vi. 5, Ex. xxxiii. 20 is adduced; compare Hitzig. Ch. xi. 15, 16, not only refers to the event in Ex. xiv., but the song of thanksgiving in ch. xii. is also a reference to Ex. xv. Here also, says Hitzig, p. 151, the parallel with the departure from Egypt is kept up, as the rescued fugitives at that time likewise praised Jehovah in a hymn (Exod. xv.); and not only does the expression כי גאות עשה in ver 5 allude to Ex. xv. 1, but the whole sentence also in ver. 2 is taken from Ex. xv. 2. On xxx. 9 Vitringa says very correctly: "Criminatio desumta est ex cantico Mosis," Deut. xxxii. 6, 20. On xxx. 17 even Gesenius confesses that Lev. xxvi. 8, Deut. xxxii. 30, are "almost verbal parallels." Ch. xxiv. 18 is taken from Gen. vii. 11. On xliv. 2, Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26, are to be compared. He also refers expressly to the *Law of Jehovah* (xxx. 9), where the Pentateuch is the more decidedly to be understood, as the passage even alludes to its expressions.

We may rest satisfied here with these single quotations for our object, since a more particular exegesis of the prophets will present still more and verify their proper conclusiveness, if it sets out with the principle of considering the Pentateuch as the basis of the expressions and ideas of the prophets. Here only the more general remark requires to be added, that the prophets invariably, and the earliest of them perhaps most impressively, exhibit that mode of viewing the Law, which we discovered previously in the period of Samuel; which speaks most emphatically against the fulfilment of the Law as an *opus operatum*. The period of the prophets is decidedly one that displays, in its full extent, the abuse that was practised with the Mosaic Law. An essential portion of the polemic and didactic labours of the prophets is directed against the perverted inclination, which, as an effect of the Law, already influ-

1 Comp. the examples in Kleinert, on the Genuineness of Isaiah, i. p. 292, ff.

enced their contemporaries in its full strength. Although this remark has by no means escaped the observation of the critics, yet there has been deduced from it the decidedly distorted conclusion, that the prophets "made the whole frame-work of the priestly service to shake;" so that the prophets have the credit of originating the development of the Law, and so far from its being a knowledge of the divine appointment of the ceremonial Law that forms the back ground of their convictions, it is, on the contrary, a rejection of that law itself.[1] This view rests indeed as much on a superficial apprehension of the Law, as on a like apprehension of the position of the contemporaries of the prophets with regard to it. For since the Pentateuch itself closely combines both the internal and the external relations, in such a way that in the concrete they are both completely one, and the external form appears only as the living reflection of the internal spirit; it was the greatest offence against the Law to make an abstract severance of these two things. Now while, on the one hand, the efforts of the prophets were directed against the destruction of the externals of the Law, as they combated idolatry, and thus showed that they regarded the former as by no means a merely human or arbitrary institution; on the other hand, they opposed the mere external maintenance of the Law, which stands fundamentally on the same level as the idolatrous tendency. The greatest profanation of the Law is the mere external observance of it; for it makes God himself and his Law the ministers of sin: to honour Jehovah in that way is simply to serve one's self,—it is idolatry in the most refined sense,—it is a human institution (Is. xxix. 13.). Accordingly, the ministry of the prophets proves precisely their living comprehension of the Law, as a *totality*, a concrete whole. But as from this cause prophecy itself cannot be conceived of without the pre-supposition of the Law, neither can the age connected with it. For that age exhibits both those aberrations, which can be understood only as one effect of the Law, produced in accordance with human nature. Hence both the abandonment of the Law as shown in gross transgressions of it, and the stiffening of it in external forms, afford evidence that the prophetic literature, when viewed on this side also, cannot be comprehended apart from the Pentateuch as its antecedent element.

[1] Comp. *e.g.* Von Bohlen, p. clii.; George, p. 172; Vatke, p. 481, ff.

In the older prophets we discover, amidst all the manifold references to the Pentateuch, a certain freedom still prevailing in the employment of its expressions, which, in the later age, and in such prophets as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, loses this independent character, and becames more of a verbal use of the work, binding itself down to the letter. The reason of this fact lies in that course of development which the prophetical literature pursued; and is explained by the general want of an independent character, which in other respects also is displayed by Hebrew literature. The more that the Theocracy was alienated from its proper central-point, the more prominently must an adherence to its positive and objective foundation appear in those who were trully theocratically minded, while the individual character retired more into the back-ground. This remark is of particular importance in reference to JEREMIAH, in whose case the often remarked affinity to Deuteronomy,—which appears in a multitude of even individual expressions, turns of thought, &c., that are reproduced in his writings,—has led to misconstructions. For apart from the fact, that the entire style of expression in Deuteronomy is demonstrably the original, the way in which that book is here employed has its profound and principal reason in the peculiar nature of Deuteronomy and its relation to the Prophet's time. For, as the character of Deuteronomy is mainly subjective and prophetical, and as its prophecy came to be fulfilled very remarkably in the time of Jeremiah, while the career of the covenant-people was now drawing near, in the manner there stated, to an essential part of the threatened punishment; it may be conceived how that book, as associated with the tender and resigned character of the Prophet, must have had such a significance to him and his time, as was actually the case. Deuteronomy, however, is also as much the compendium of what the rest of the legislation contained in fuller detail, as it is the peculiarly subjective apprehension of the Law and reflection upon it; so that from its very nature it stands as the necessary type of later prophecy, and it could not but appear strange were we not to find it employed in this way. But at the same time this employment of it appears also not to have arisen merely from the Prophet's individual character, but likewise from the necessities of the time. Several considerations lead us to regard the Law as having been at that period a subject of study and research. Jeremiah speaks of the priests, as those who handle (תֹּפְשֵׂי) the Law;

ii. 8. They think themselves wise in their exposition of the Law, while through the expositions and interpretations of the scribes (סופרים) Jehovah's Law was turned into falsehood (viii. 8.). They held firmly to the Law, indeed as firmly to it as to their perverted view of it (xviii. 18.). They did violence to the Law (חמסו התורה), Zeph. iii. 4, Ezek. xxii. 26. So they taught and instructed the people.[1] Thus we see that even then the Law had become in an increasing degree the subject of reflection; and no doubts prevailed as to its authority, though there very likely were doubts as to the understanding of it. Here too it appears how Deuteronomy was best adapted, from its nature, to introduce one into the internal character and the profound significance of the Law. Hence the frequent allusion to that book.

This then also overturns from its very foundation the view that regards the age of Jeremiah as that of the origin of the Pentateuch, or at least of its earliest portions. Not only is such a spirit as this age betrays (when in every departure from the Law everything external still revolves around it), incapable of producing such works inventively; but, on the contrary, the age marks itself as distinguished, in comparison with earlier periods, by a still more advanced degree of stiffenedness in the forms of the Law. It was in opposition to such an age that Jeremiah could utter the bold expression, that God gave no commandment to their fathers, when he led them out of Egypt, respecting sacrifices (vii. 22), because the age made that the initial and central point of the Mosaic system, which was only its inference, and did not comprehend the covenant-relation (ver. 23)—the intimate connection with men into which God had entered by the declaration, that he would be the God of the people. But from him who does not know the initial and ultimate point, or the principle of a system, its consistency also will be equally concealed. Thus sacrifices, taken in that manner, had not been prescribed to the people: it was better to neglect them altogether than to perform them hypocritically. But modern criticism has misunderstood this passage, as if it contained a contradiction of the divine authority and Mosaic origin of the sacrificial law; or proceeded from an author who knew not the Sinaitic legislation.[2] On the other hand, more consideration has been paid

1 Comp. Ezek. vii. 26, xxii. 26, xliv. 23. Movers, l. c. p. 300.

2 Comp. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 185. But ver. 23 is even a *verbal* quotation from the Pentateuch, so that the above is at any rate the worst possible view of the passage.

by this criticism to the important bearing of the use of Deuteronomy in Jeremiah, and the previous existence of Deuteronomy on that account has been maintained, on the supposition that the Prophet was acquainted with that book *only*, while he is thought to show here, as well as everywhere else, a complete non-acquaintance with the other books of the Pentateuch.[1] A marvellous assertion! As if Deuteronomy contained not a word about the sacrificial law —or perhaps the portions relating to it are spurious? But it may be shown even to excess by several striking passages, how well the Prophet is acquainted, not only with Genesis, to which he frequently refers, but with the other books also. In Jerem. xlviii. the oracle Num. xxi. 28, ff., is quoted even to the *words*. In Jerem. xxxiv. 17, ff., reference is made to that very chapter of Leviticus, ch. xxv., which the opponents of the genuineness are accustomed to regard as the latest portion of that book. And, on the whole, what is the use of this argument, when, even with the greatest possible scepticism, and by the admission of the opponents even,[2] it cannot be disputed as to Ezekiel that he shows the most exact acquaintance with the whole of the Pentateuch? Are we to suppose that the Prophet in Babylon knew more of the extent of this work, than he who lived in Palestine?

§ 38. TESTIMONIES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH FROM THE OTHER WRITINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

If we give one glance more to the remaining documents of Hebrew antiquity, it is evident at once that the writings belonging to the age of David and Solomon must have most weight and interest in relation to the criticism of the Pentateuch. As we have already found in that period, in another department, evidences of the existence of the Pentateuch, we must regard these writings again as only serving to supply supplementary testimonies. Here also it may be shown anew very completely, that the poetry of the PSALMS in particular, the flourishing epoch of which we are obliged to assign to the age of David, pre-supposes the Pentateuch, both

1 So George, ibid. p. 16, ff. V. Bohlen gives quite a confused account of the relation between Jeremiah and the Pentateuch, p. clxxviii., sq.

2 Comp. *e. g.* Hartmann, p. 574.

in its general and special character. In the first place, that whole class of poetry in general, and the peculiar form of mental excitement displayed in it, can be satisfactorily explained only by that circumstance. For the very expression of thought, whether it assumes a more subjective and individual character, or is supported by something objective, leads to such a supposition. The peculiarity of the mental characteristics [Subjektivität] here displayed, is the reflection of the Law: the prevailing consciousness of sin, the lamentation over it which lays hold of everything, and the comfortable certainty of forgiveness and of the divine anger being appeased,—as occurring in the so-called penitential Psalms, and forming the fundamental tone in them; all this, in its very peculiarity, being found no where else as it is here, is only the operation, the subjective echo of the Law. The most decisive testimony to the truth of this is, that the authors of the Psalms can all agree together in the sentiment of the first Psalm, that their whole soul is moved by delight in the Law and meditation upon it. This opinion, however, is raised to complete certainty by the fact, that in every instance, where this poetry enters the domain of the objective, it does not proceed there capriciously and arbitrarily, but always takes up and treats a given subject. There is no class of Psalms that does not in this respect present a definite subject. Thus the Psalms on creation are only the echo of the history of the creation in the Pentateuch, to which they make verbal reference not unfrequently. The historical matters relating to the people of God, and the glorification of Jehovah in them, refer altogether to the Law, the covenant, the conducting of the people, as presented in the Pentateuch. No important subject in that book can be named, that is not celebrated in the Psalms more or less expressly or fully; and it is therefore obvious that they must contain no small number of special references to the Pentateuch.

Thus the history of the creation is touched upon in many of the Psalms.[1] Ps. viii. is an express and full adduction of Gen. i. 26, ff.; Ps. xix. has regard to Gen. i. 7; Ps. xxiv. 1, 2, to Gen. i. 2, 9, 10, 22; Ps. xxxiii. 6, to Gen. ii. 1; Ps. xxix. 10, xxxiii. 7, et al. are references to the Deluge. The history of the patriarchs is referred to in Ps. xlvii. 10; lx. 9 (Gen. xlix. 10, comp. Num. xxi.,

1 Comp. Jahn, Einl. ii. p. 28, ff.; see also J. D. Michaelis, Einl. p. 196, ff.

18); cv., cx. 4, et al. Allusion is made so frequently to the history of the Mosaic period, that almost every single remarkable occurrence of it is mentioned here (see Jahn, ibid. p. 32, ff.). The *Law* is frequently introduced in a general way (Pss. i. xix., cxix., et al.), and in particular as a written document in Ps. xl. 8. Individual laws are brought forward not less frequently, as the prohibition to take usury, Ps. xv. 5; the law of purification, Levit. xiv. 4—7 (comp. Num. xix. 6, 18), see Ps. li. 9; the sacrifices are frequently mentioned, xl. 14, xlvi. 13, li. 18, lxvi. 13—15, cxvi. 14, 18, et al., and the feasts also in the songs for the feasts, and those for the Temple, &c.

Since the Psalms then present us in so decided a manner with these references to the Pentateuch, the criticism employed by our opponents in reference to this matter need disturb us the less, especially as that criticism cannot receive its complete confutation till afterwards. But it makes us at once regard it with suspicion, that, in order to maintain the non-authenticity of the Pentateuch, hypotheses that are quite uncritical, which would now hardly gain a hearing with judicious expositors, are proposed with respect to the Psalms as well. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 155, ff., at once sets it down as a point incapable of proof, that a Psalm is by David, affirming that the only criticism that is possible in reference to the Psalms, is that which follows the principles of æsthetics in judging by the internal worth of a Psalm, &c. Thus here again every historical ground is shaken, and from this purely negative point of view the criticism respecting the Pentateuch is also handled.

But these learned writers wholly mistake and overlook the main question. That which ought properly to be pointed out on their view of the matter is prudently evaded. In the first place, supposing a part of the Psalms was composed prior to the origin of the Pentateuch, it must be pointed out that these same Psalms necessarily require to be viewed as antecedent to it in point of time. With reference to this, that which the opponents designate as an unlevitical spirit,[1] found in some old Psalms, and which they therefore call anti-Mosaic, is only an external superficial conception; since with respect to *every* song it may be shown that it is composed from the point of view proper to the Israelites; the deter-

[1] Comp. e. g, Von Bohlen, p. cl.

mination of which flows solely from the Law. Thus, for instance, the idea of justice which Ps. iii. exhibits as chastising all that is anti-theocratical, and rewarding all the godly, is by no means one that has arisen separate from the Law, but one that is precisely founded upon it. From what other source should the poet know that Jehovah blesses his *own people*, that his enemies are likewise God's enemies and exposed to his vengeance, that help comes from Jehovah's holy hill;—if we do not here hold to that positive foundation, which explains to us the existence of such remarkably distinct and sure religious convictions. The problem, therefore, is to prove, that, in the Hebrew mind, the period of that subjective religious development which we meet with in the Psalms, was the earlier. But this would be taking such a view of it as would make it a simply *natural* thing, while it is the opposite of that, the subjugating of the natural element, and the apprehension of the natural mode of life as ungodly; and in this way falls under a new category, which finds its solution only in the peculiarly new element which appears in the Hebrew people of this period.

Besides, it would form a second problem for this criticism, not only to point out what is un-Mosaic and anti-Mosaic in the old poetry of the Psalms, but also to explain the composition, subsequently to the supposed origin of the Pentateuch, of those songs in which undoubted and express reference is made to it. But so far is it as yet from the solution of that problem, that it has not made so much as a beginning in definitions of the kind, so that its decisions can be combated only in individual detail.

The same thing is true of Proverbs also, and of the Song of Solomon. But it would require a special examination of these writings themselves, to comprehend their proper relation to the Pentateuch; for which therefore we refer to a following part of the work.

§ 39. THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

The apocryphal literature follows in order the canonical literature. Here we find, however, only one opinion generally prevalent, respecting both the writer and the authority of the Pentateuch. Among all the sacred writings there is none that is so generally and so unqualifiedly regarded as a divine and immutable rule. "However

true it may be, says Sack (Apolog. p. 171), that criticism in the scientific sense of the word was not the business of antiquity, yet we know from later proofs that in no nation was the faculty of precise enquiry and distinction so completely cultivated by the learned, as among the Jews; and after the return from the exile, this faculty, especially amidst so many doctrinal divisions that were to be promoted by it, would easily have discovered arguments against the age of the Pentateuch or single divisions of it, if tradition had but supplied some matter for it to work upon. But, instead of this, we find both Pharisees and Sadducees agreed as to the reception of the Mosaic writings."

Considering how numerous the opposite parties were, into which the Judaism of the period subsequent to the exile was divided, this fact is the more surprising. We would refer only to the Alexandrine Judaism which arose after that epoch, the opposition of which to the Judaism of Palestine was in some measure softened and concealed by the special importance which even the former assigned to the Pentateuch. One interesting fact is the reception of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans, which deserves a more particular examination, on account of the different judgments that have been passed respecting it. After the kingdom of Israel had been deprived by Esarhaddon of its last inhabitants, and had received new colonists in their stead,[1] there arose among them a sense of their need to serve the God of the land (2 Kings xvii. 26); and they obtained some of the priests who had been carried away to instruct them in the new religion. Thus there arose in this part of Palestine a syncretistic mode of worship, in which the deities of Assyria and Babylonia received conjoint honours with Jehovah. In particular, the services of the high places, as they had existed in the kingdom of Israel, were established at the suggestion of those priests, and priests of the high places were appointed from amongst the new heathen colonists. These circumstances existed even in the time of the author of the books of Kings. From the view which he takes of that mixed people, we obtain a pretty vivid picture of their practices and their relation to the covenant-people. They paid indeed a certain reverence to Jehovah; but he distinctly denies their adoption of the Law (ver. 40.). He expressly makes a

1 Comp. 2 Kings xvii. 24, sq.; Hengstenberg, Beitr. z. Einl. i. p. 177.

contrast between them and the children of Jacob, who knew the written Law of Jehovah; and will not admit that these nations, as completely involved in heathen fashions and adhering to them, are to be counted among the Israelites (vers. 34—38.). The influence, therefore, which the priestly instruction referred to had had, can have been only quite superficial. We cannot in this case conceive of a proper communication of the Pentateuch, the less so as the heathen element maintained a most decided preponderance, so that the Israelitish element, already weak in itself, was almost entirely lost in it. The latter had yet to receive its last blow from the act of Josiah, who destroyed the worship on the high places, which had been again renewed in the land, and slew the priests who had been appointed in connection with it (2 Kings xxiii. 15, 16.). But still this did not root out the disposition, mentioned in the book of Kings xvii. 33, to combine the worship of Jehovah with idolatry. That disposition, as it was deeply rooted in the nature of heathenism, would be sure to show itself again on the first opportunity. This opportunity was the more alluring, as with the religious concern to form a part of the covenant-people in a religious respect, there were also external advantages associated; and the prospect of these excited them to assert their claims to that fellowship. Yet they had also—especially regarding the matter from *their* point of view—much that was plausible on their side to sustain these claims. When the Jews on their return from the exile commenced the building of the Temple, the moment of reunion appeared to them to have arrived, and they made an offer to take part in the building of the Temple. The readiness with which they then made application to the Jews, shows that they had themselves no regular worship or priests as yet, and that their whole condition must have had a very unsettled character,[1] as it hardly could have been expected to be otherwise after the previous occurrences. At the same time they expressly described themselves on this occasion as of heathen origin (Ezra iv. 9, 10), and made no use of any sort of Israelitish relationship, and were as little recognised as having any such relationship by the Jews, who on the contrary firmly maintained against them the rigid exclusiveness of theocratic separation. Subsequently, they also made an attempt to hinder the Jews in

1 See De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 210, ff.

building the walls of Jerusalem (Nehem. vi.), which only shows the provocation they felt at the previous refusal and their own unsuccessful machinations.

We can by no means regard the Samaritans up to this time as having been in possession of the Law. Had that been the case, they would have brought it forward in support of their claims, and would have appealed to it before every thing in opposition to the Jews. The possession of the Pentateuch, and the recognition of it as a religious rule, formed in this case the most decisive argument, and the most effective means, to obtain what they desired of the Jews. But their own words, so utterly indefinite: "We will seek your God as ye do" (Ezr. iv. 2), plainly expressed the contrary. On the other hand, we find that under Nehemiah Jewish fugitives betook themselves to Samaria.[1] These Levitical priests established there a Jewish form of worship, the final result of which, namely, the erection of the Temple on Gerizim, built in imitation of the Jewish, was at length effected under Alexander.

That the introduction of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans belongs to the time when those fugitives went among them, is even in itself in the highest degree probable. The new establishment of the worship, the eager adoption of it, the subsequent building of the Temple, the whole way in which the Levitical priests conducted themselves in the case, are circumstances that presuppose the reception of the work by that people at the time referred to. This conjecture, however, would still remain only a conjecture, having only itself to support it, were it not raised to certainty by a notice in Josephus. The notice is this: the Samaritans apply to Alexander with the petition, that he would remit them the taxes in the seventh year, because they did not sow their fields that year,—consequently they observed the Sabbatic year (Antiq. xi. 8.). "Hinc recte colligitur legis Mosaicæ in aliis quoque capitibus apud eos in usu fuisse observantiam"—says Buddeus, H. E. 2, p. 1042. They could also hardly have given themselves out at once for Hebrews at that time, had not external appearances been in favour of their assertion, and seemed to support their wish to pass for such. That they were not indeed much in earnest in this wish,

1 Comp. Nehem. xiii. 28, 29, with Josephus, Antiq. xi. 7. The latter indeed places the occurrence later under Darius Codomannus, but certainly by mistake, as we shall see more particularly afterwards.

we see from their history in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, when they denied this Jewish origin of theirs, as it threatened to involve them in danger; but this proves nothing more than the external and hyprocritical manner in which Samaritanism accommodated itself to Judaism.

It must therefore be regarded as established at least, that by the time of Alexander the Great, the Samaritans had become possessed of the Pentateuch, and that it had been transmitted into their hands by Jewish agency. The concern betrayed by the Samaritans in this as well as in other things, to cling closely to the basis of the Jewish state, namely the Law, and to claim it on their behalf, proves at the same time with what jealous strictness the Judaism of the times subsequent to the exile watched over its preservation, and the vindication of it for itself. The Law here forms, both with friend and foe, the central point of all effort and all development.

But the subsequent course of Samaritanism must the less be overlooked in connection with this formation of it, as it unquestionably exercised an influence on their religious development. Already under Alexander, Samaritans had been transplanted to Egypt (Ant. xi. 8.). Ptolemy Lagi did the same, transplanting a multitude of them to Lower Egypt and Alexandria (Ant. xii. 1.). The important bearing of this circumstance appears from the consideration, that Samaritanism in its endeavour to approximate to Judaism must have found opportunity for this in particular amongst the Alexandrine Jews, who held less firmly to the Law and to stiff Judaism. Here too the account of Josephus (Ant. xiii. 3)—which informs us of the dispute which arose between the Samaritans and the Alexandrine Jews respecting the building of the Temple in Leontopolis, in which both parties appealed to the Law, and wished the dispute decided according to it,—supplies us with as certain a testimony to the existence of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans, as to the contact into which the two parties came with one another at that time. There must have been persons then among the Samaritans, who occupied themselves by profession with the Pentateuch and the study of it. The peculiar character, however, of Alexandrine Judaism must have impressed itself upon them all the more, as they themselves came to it, devoid of a firm point of support and a fixed religious character. Thus they took up many dogmas and principles, such as the avoidance of anthropomorphisms,

the pure spirituality of the angels (δυνάμεις, חילים), the doctrine of the resurrection, the special prominence given to Moses and the Pentateuch above all the other persons and writings of the Old Testament.[1] These things were communicated to their Pentateuch, and they certainly introduced into it alterations of that sort with so much the more freedom, as in this too they had only to follow the example of the Alexandrine Jews. In this way arose that recension of the Pentateuch, which even still possesses force and validity among the Samaritans as the document of their religion; the striking agreement of which with the Alexandrine recension can be sufficiently explained only by this external and internal contact of the two parties. This revision, however, as the nature of the case and the condition of the Samaritan Pentateuch also show, is to be conceived only as a gradual one, undertaken according to different circumstances and objects; and this circumstance also leads to the adoption of our previous conclusion, that the Samaritans must have brought the Pentateuch with them into Egypt.[2]

The enquiry relating to this subject has been considerably embarrassed by writers asserting, or rather taking for granted what had little foundation, as to the origin of Samaritanism and its connection with the Israelitish religious constitution. It was thought that the Samaritans had received the Pentateuch from those who formed the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, as they were considered to be their descendants. The Samaritans would never have received that work, it was supposed, from the hatred which prevailed betweem them and the Jews, had it not previously existed in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes; and even there it could not have been found, had it not been introduced before the separation of the two kingdoms.[3] In this way some believed they had gained a proof of the genuineness of the Pentateuch; others again[4] believed they acted more cautiously, in drawing from it the conclusion that the Pentateuch was

1 Comp. Gesenius, De Samarit. theologiâ ex fontibus ined. com.—Halæ, 1822.

2 Compare with this the essay on the Liter. Anz. 1833. Nr. 38, ff. with which I am quite agreed as to the negative part; but the positive side of it I can adopt only with the modifications that have been stated.

3 So Eichhorn, 3, p. 199. Eckermann, Beitr. ibid. p. 33, ff. Jahn, Einl. ii. p. 71, ff. Ch. Fr. Fritzsche, ibid. p. 83, ff. Rosenmüller, Prolegg. p. 38, sq. Steudel, in Bengel's Archiv. 3, p. 626, ff. Mazade, sur l'origine l'age et l'état crit. du Pent. Samar. Genève, 1830, et al.

4 So Bertholdt particularly, iii. p. 814, ff.

composed shortly before the separation of the two kingdoms. In this argument truth and falsehood are strangely intermingled. The foundation of the hypothesis is an assumption that is quite incapable of proof, namely, the identity of the Samaritan Pentateuch with that of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. But the connection of the two parties was purely imaginary: even if the Israelites had long been in possession of the Pentateuch, it would by no means follow from that, that they transmitted it to the Samaritans. The heathen origin of the latter, and their long adherence to heathenism, are, however, directly opposed to the opinion.[1] On the other hand, the kingdom of the Ten Tribes was justly regarded as in possession of the Pentateuch, as we have also already shown.

The opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, on the contrary, denied the existence of the Pentateuch in the kingdom of Israel; and as they assigned the date of its composition to the period just before the captivity, or to the time of the captivity itself, they maintained the opinion, as supported by other historical facts, of its introduction among the Samaritans in the age of Manasses,[2] [the fugitive priest, son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite, see Nehem. xiii. 28.]. They had also an object in regarding the Samaritans as Jews, apostate Israelites, and in this way gaining one argument more against the genuineness of the Pentateuch from the book not being in existence among them at an earlier period. On the other hand, these writers have the unquestionable merit of having first directed attention to a more historical examination of that fact of the introduction of the Pentateuch. The premises of their view must necessarily fall to the ground, but it certainly gives a correct account of the historical fact, even though all that is comprehended in the fact be not completely recognized.[3]

1 See the proof of this well brought out in the Liter. Anz. ibid.

2 So Fulda, in Paulus Memorab. vii. p. 21. Paulus, Comment. z. N. T. iv. p. 252, ff. Vater, p. 623, ff. De Wette, Beitr. i. p. 214, ff. Gesenius, de Pentat. Samar. p. 9, sq. Bleek, in the ibid. p. 63, ff. et al.

3 Other hypotheses, such as that Josiah gave the Samaritans the Pentateuch (Von Cölln, in the Hall. Lit. Zeit. 1828. Ergänz. Bl. Nr. 13), are destitute of all historical foundation.

§ 40. THE TESTIMONY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

That which we meet with as a firm conviction in the whole of Judaism and even in the case of Christ's contemporaries,[1] namely, the recognition of the Pentateuch as a sacred work composed by Moses under divine direction, is not only never contradicted by Christ and his apostles, but they even confirm that view as being quite their own and the only true one. This may be shown by a multitude of passages. The Lord himself testifies that Moses *wrote* of Christ: belief in the *writings* of Moses and in his own *words* are joined together in the most intimate connection, John v. 46, 47. In reference to a discourse in which the relation of Christ to Moses is so distinctly indicated as it is there, and in which the divinity of the Redeemer's mission is represented as connected with the divine authority of the Law, and as constituting with it one whole, there can be no thought of any kind of misunderstanding; and the reference to the Law would have been decidedly inadmissible and wrong, if our Lord had not intended to recognise the Law in its full and well established claims. With this other analogous expressions of Christ are quite accordant; comp. Luke xxiv. 27, 44; Mark xii. 26. Quotations from all the books of the Pentateuch are found in the New Testament. Its history is constantly adduced as a true history, which stands essentially related to the Gospel; and its laws are equally regarded as divine laws delivered by Moses to the people in the Pentateuch (comp. *e. g.* Rom. x. 5; Acts xv. 21; Hebr. xiii. 12, 13, &c.); its predictions are represented as fulfilled in Christ, and have accordingly a real divine origin assigned them.

It is manifest that the view which takes Christ and his apostles to be what they give themselves out for, can recognise nothing but truth in these expressions, and find in them the higher sanction of that conclusion to which true critical inquiry also will constantly lead, namely the genuineness of the Pentateuch. As for a book, full of institutes proceeding from the late inventions of priests, compiled from corrupt popular legends, without any historical founda-

1 Comp. *e. g.* Matth. xix. 7; Mark xii. 19; John i. 46; Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 6, 3.

tion ; we cannot tell why it should deserve a preference above the παραδόσεις of the Pharisees, which indeed had arisen only on that basis : we should be compelled to inflict the severest censure on such a proceeding as would leave untouched the deeper root of the corruption, while with such partiality the lesser evil was marked as an evil, but that which was far greater passed over in silence.

An endeavour was made even by Clericus[1] to get rid of this troublesome authority, with the remark that Christ and the apostles did not come into the world to instruct the Jews in criticism ; and the most recent of the opponents also think they have obviated that objection, by observing that faith in Christ cannot set limits to critical enquiries, otherwise it would prove a hinderance to the knowledge of the truth.[2] But an older theologian justly replied to this : "Enim vero non fuere Christus et Apostoli critices doctores, quales se haberi postulant, qui hodie sibi regnum litterarum in quavis vindicant scientia ; fuerunt tamen doctores veritatis, neque passi sunt sibi per communem ignorantiam aut procerum astum imponi. Non certe in mundum venere ut vulgares errores foverent, suaque auctoritate munirent, nec per Judæos solum sed et populos unice a se pendentes longe lateque spargerent."[3] It must at least be granted that, if our opponents' view of the Pentateuch holds good, our view of the Redeemer with regard to his veracity is not to be adopted without qualification ; and that He who designates himself as the Truth, can say so only in a limited sense, so that even that expression does not so much as admit of the application He gave it to the saving truth itself, since (as we have seen) in reference to that truth He regarded his personal position to the Old Testament Law and its author as being as far as possible from a non-essential point. The conflicting nature of such a view of the Pentateuch with the view given in the New Testament, shows then where the rejection of the Pentateuch leads, and in what opposition the assertion referred to places itself. If a belief in Christ really stands in such close connection with a belief in Moses as the Saviour testifies, then the consequence follows, to which the criticism of the opponents of the genuineness is necessarily driven, namely the rejection of the authority of Christ. "And thus," says Sack, Apol. p. 170, "the

1 In the Sentimens de quelques theologiens, etc. p. 126.
2 De Wette, Einl. § 163.
3 Witsius, Miscellan. Sac. i. p. 117.

dawning of literature in its oldest productions, which are otherwise from the nature of the case involved in obscurity, may be proved by the words of Him who claimed the name of the Truth, to be even still the first and surest testimony for all enquiry which retains confidence in the words of Christ."

§ 41. HISTORY OF THE ATTACKS MADE UPON THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

A great agreement has at all times prevailed in the whole of the Jewish and the Christian church, in the assertion of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. The few exceptions that occurred in ancient times, and the nature of the reasons that led them to an opposite assertion, only serve to confirm the point. As an instance from the most ancient period of Christianity, Ptolemy the Gnostic is commonly adduced, as a disputer of the genuineness. But his attack is properly directed only against the divine origin of the Law.[1] He asserts it to have been given, partly by Moses, partly by the elders of the nation—an opinion that cannot surprise us, considering the arbitrary sentiments of that party, occasioned by their dogmatic tendencies. Of as little critical worth are the accounts we have relating to the Nazarenes and the Clementines, which in a similar manner bring forward doubts of the divine authority of the Mosaic Law.[2] Those histories contained in the Pentateuch, which they regarded as offensive and unworthy of Scripture, principally formed with them a welcome subject of polemic attack, which appeared likely to prove most effective, when directed against that book of the Old Testament which was accounted the most sacred. Opponents of Christianity, such as Celsus and Julian, went farther, as they at once represented the historical portions of the work as mythi, and paralleled them with the heathen fables.[3]

The passage in Hieronymus [Jerome] *contra Helvidium* has still less connection with the question; where he says, " sive Mosen

1 In his Epistola ad Floram, in Epiphanius, Hæres. xxxiii. 8.

2 Comp. Joh. Damasc. De hær. § 18. Clement. Homil. ii. 38, 40, iii. 47; with which compare Neander, Gnost. Systeme, p. 280, 286. Credner, in Winer's Wissensch. Zeitschr. i. 2, p. 256.

3 Comp. Von Cölln, Lehrb. d. Dogmengesch. i. p. 117, ff.

dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Esram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso." The father is here referring to the Jewish tradition of the restoration of the Old Testament writings by Ezra. Now this tradition by no means disputed the authenticity of the Pentateuch, but represented Ezra as its restorer, who by inspiration had been enabled to replace the authentic text as it existed previously to the captivity. This Jewish fable had spread very much and gained some importance among the fathers; hence the tone of recognition in which Jerome here speaks of it, although he certainly discerned its intrinsic untenableness.

Thus we do not meet with properly critical doubts in ancient times; we can still appeal to the constancy and complete unanimity of general ecclesiastical tradition in the assertion of the genuineness; and it was the Rabbinism of the middle ages, in the representatives of its freer tendencies, that first made a certain attempt towards questioning the authenticity. But even here the doubts advanced are still so much concealed, that it may be seen what authority was felt to be arrayed against one. Isaac ben Jasos, in the beginning of the 11th century, propounded the opinion (in his commentary, which is known only from quotations), that some sections of the Pentateuch were composed far later than Moses; *e. g.*, Gen. xxxvi. in the reign of Jehoshaphat.[2] Abenezra, who mentions the assertion referred to, and emphatically disapproves of it, appears to have taken up the opinion, not so much of the non-authenticity of the Pentateuch, as of single interpolated passages rather; yet he too speaks on this point with great obscurity.[3]

For the honour of being commonly named as the first assailant of the genuineness, the last mentioned Rabbinical writer has properly to thank Spinoza, who in his *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, ch. viii., appeals to his authority. Spinoza brings out not without acuteness[4] particular reasons, in favour of the late composition of the work, and thinks it probable that the Pentateuch received its present form from Ezra. He found among others an able opponent in the Dutch writer, Franc. Cuper, *Arcana Atheismi refutata, Rotterod.* 1676, *quarto*.

1 See on that J. D. Michaelis. Einl. i. p. 174, ff.

2 Comp. Maier, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1832, H. 3. p. 639, ff.

3 Comp. Maier, ibid. p. 634, ff.; also Rosenmüller, Prolegg. p. 21.

4 It is remarkable that he regards Deuteronomy as the book that was first composed.

But even previously to Spinoza, some learned men had come forward maintaining the non-authenticity, though certainly without stating much in support of the opinion. To these assaults belong Carlstadt's assertion (De canon. scriptt.) : " defendi potest Mosen non fuisse scriptorem quinque librorum;" A. Masius (in Comment. ad libr. Jos.), who decided that the separate portions of the Pentateuch were subsequently put together; Is. Peyrerius, who attacked the historical portions in a frivolous manner, in the Syst. Theol. ex Præadamit. hypoth.; Hobbes, who declared, " Videtur Pentateuchus potius de Mose quam a Mose scriptus." (Leviathan, c. 33.). The subject was handled at greater length afterwards by Richard Simon, Clericus, and Van Dale, who however differ more or less from one another in their conclusions. The best refutation of these views is to be found in Heidegger, Exercitat. Bibl. t. i. p. 246, sqq. Witsius, Miscell. Sacr. t. i., p. 103, sq. Carpzov. Introd. i. p. 38, sq. Clericus, in a subsequent treatise *De scriptore Pentateuchi*, retracted the greater part of the views he had formerly expressed.

After the frivolity of English, French, and German Deism had sufficiently exhausted itself in scoffing at the Pentateuch, the time came when it was thought well to throw concealment over the wantonness formerly shown by a more scientific array of reasons, and to impress a more serious character on the doubts advanced. Among the attempts of greater importance that were now made, the following may be distinctly mentioned. Fulda[1] proceeded on the view, that Hebrew literature, from its linguistic character, pointed to one and the same period as that of its origin; so that the Pentateuch in its present shape is a revision of older compositions presented in a later form. It is only single pieces that give evidence of being ancient: the whole existed only in fragments until the time of David: then a collection of laws began to be made, which was still different, however, from our Pentateuch. The latter was first completed about the time of the Babylonian Captivity. Nachtigall's (Otmar) view[2] was also similar to this, in which he came to the conclusion, that the Pentateuch was compiled (perhaps by Jeremiah) about the time of the Captivity, from many ancient, and partly also

1 In the Neues Repert. of Paulus, Part iii., and Memorabilien St. 7.

2 In Henke's Magazin, vol. ii. and vol. iv.

genuine Mosaic collections. Schuster[1] again would have the composition of the Pentateuch referred to the age of David and Solomon; but he also conceded to Moses a considerable share in it, especially in the legal portions. Similar opinions were held by Paulus (Comment. z. N. T. iv. p. 230, ff.), Bertholdt, and others.

But, while these writers impugned the genuineness, there were not wanting able defenders of it. Along with productions of a more compliant character, and written under the influence of the spirit of the age, such as those of Jerusalem and Lüderwald, J. D. Michaelis (Einl. ins A. T., Part I.) still stands forth as far superior in learning to the opponents. But he very much lacks acute judgment. Eichhorn's defence still remains remarkable and unique of its kind. This highly-gifted man unquestionably brought to the task not only talent, but also a great sense of the simple, sublime, and venerable character of the work. There are acknowledgments made by him in reference to that point, which are as deserving of esteem as of consideration. It is true, we often find more of declamation and rhetoric in him, than of pointed and relevant reasons. He rather turns the opponents into contempt and scorn, than refutes them. There is also manifest in him in the latter period of his life, a greater tendency to compliance with the opinions of the age. False notions, and defences that take up the Deistical point of view, and the natural mode of explanation, frequently deprive his apologetic labours of their proper force and truth. However much these apologetic labours were at variance with the author's doctrinal system, yet they had so much that was fascinating and winning about them, and of an imposing character from the authority of the man, that they exerted the greatest influence on contemporaries, who were more or less like-minded with him, as Corrodi, Eckermann, Bauer, and others; so that no one ventured to make a decided attack on the Pentateuch.

In 1805 Vater's Commentary appeared. The germs, which Eichhorn's Document-hypothesis contained, as matter for disputing the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, were there developed and modified. The non-authenticity of the Pentateuch was now grounded on the Fragment-hypothesis, and every single portion was assigned

1 "Aelteste Sagen der Bibel nach ihrem historischen und praktischen Gehalte." Lüneburg, 1804.

to a different age, most of them to the Captivity. Augusti, in his *Introduction*, agreed with him as to the main point. By De Wette, with whom Gesenius agreed, this opinion was developed further, and more precisely defined. According to him, Genesis and Exodus belonged to the period from Samuel to Joram, Leviticus and Numbers are to be assigned to that of the Assyrian captivity, and Deuteronomy to that of the Babylonian. Volney's[1] view of the origin of the present Pentateuch is that it was a work compiled by Hilkiah, Shaphan, comp. 2 Kings xxii., and the prophet Jeremiah. Schumann, Prolegg. p. xxxvi. sq., represents Ezra, on the ground of Jewish tradition, as elaborating and completing the Law. Hartmann will have it that the separate pieces came into existence gradually, even into the period of the Captivity, without, however, fixing the origin of the whole more exactly. Ammon (Fortbildung des Christenthums i. p. 123, ff.) considers the Pentateuch as a work planned by Moses, continued up to the times of Solomon, quite forgotten during the prevalence of idolatry, discovered again by Hilkiah, and restored under the name of Moses by him or one of his followers. Von Bohlen points to the fact mentioned in 2 Kings xxii. as explaining the origin of Deuteronomy, but regards other portions as far later, and even subsequent to the Captivity, so that, referring the origin of the work as a whole to that period, he represents the Pentateuch as being gradually developed even down to the time of Christ. Vatke (see his Bibl. Theol. i. p. 542, ff.) maintains that the legislation was not completely finished even in the Captivity; that then also many of the mythi and ideas in the Pentateuch were adopted and received their full form—while the whole was probably completed by the zeal of Ezra.

These opponents of the genuineness, however, of whom we have only named the chief, who deserve special regard, have also been met by refutations that are in part very thorough. Among them, Jahn is distinguished by thoroughness and learning. Single valuable contributions have proceeded from Stäudlin, in defence of the Mosaic laws; Kanne, Bibl. Untersuch. und Auslegg. (Parts I. II.), Ch. Fr. Fritzsche, Scheibel, &c. The most important is the defence by Rosenmüller (Scholia, third ed.), which, though it does not exhaust the subject, has excited great attention on account of

1 Recherches nouvelles sur l'histoire ancienne, t. i. Compare the extract by Rosenmüller, in Bertholdt's Krit. Journal, viii. 1, pp. 69—80.

the high standing of the author, who formerly maintained the opposite view. Herbst, in the treatises which we have frequently quoted, indulges in very arbitrary hypotheses, which contain however single remarks of great worth. Pareau has with much learning assailed in particular the mythical hypothesis of the opponents; and his *Institutio interpretis Vet. Test.* also contains much that is deserving of attention in defence of the genuineness in general. Sack (Apol. p. 151, ff.), has with seriousness and effect again directed attention to the weakness of the dogmatic ground on which the views of the opponents rest, and has presented the arguments for the genuineness in a concise and conclusive form. It is also of importance, that Bleek more recently has again begun to claim a considerable portion of the Mosaic books for their true author. Among English and French writers, Horne and Cellerier have undertaken the defence of the authenticity, without however contributing much that is their own. In general it must be confessed, that the defenders for the most part occupy too much the standing-point of the opponents, instead of surveying and mastering it, and thus subjecting it to a proper estimate; hence we frequently desiderate an exposure and contesting of the opposite principles; by adopting which in their criticism, that criticism itself has been put in fetters, from which it can be set free, only by a decided and consistent adherence to the positive fundamental principle.

§ 42. GENERAL CONCLUDING REMARKS.

1. If we look now at these various views of the opponents, the first thing about them that must excite our surprise, is their total want of all positive unity. In spite of all their protestations,[1] this circumstance shows the great arbitrariness of the principles on which they have gone to work in their criticism. Bertholdt himself makes the just remark, that the only thing of consequence is the fixing of the date at which the Pentateuch in its present extent was certainly in existence. But it is just as to this point that the important difference referred to prevails; and as the recent school of criticism also took up the opinion of the Pentateuch's consisting of single

[1] Comp. *e. g.* Bertholdt, iii. p. 809.

separate pieces, it had provided a still wider field for giving a freer and stronger exhibition of that difference. The confusion that has arisen in this way, has undeniably inflicted the greatest injury on the quarter whence it proceeded. No one among all these recent critics has given so much as any kind of clear delineation of the mode of this book's origin; which is the more surprising, considering the great confidence with which the age of single pieces is decided.

2. If the Pentateuch is not the work of him, who names himself in it as its author, it is the work of *deception*. The history is then an untrue history; the laws are falsely ascribed to Moses; the predictions have been invented *post eventum*. It is difficult to say, who can have been the inventing party in this case. If single pieces were in circulation among the Israelitish people under the name of Moses, nothing else can be supposed than that there existed a feeling of interest regarding them. How they should then have been arbitrarily multiplied, it is not easy to see, especially when we consider the character of the Law itself. It is so far from flattering either the people, or their rulers the priests, that it rather delivers a valid testimony against them. Had it been possible, they would rather have destroyed the Pentateuch, than have brought it out in its present accusatory form. The history sufficiently shows what endeavours were made to get rid of the Law, to evade it and to destroy its power; and what disobedience was shown towards it. Least of all did the Law, especially this Law based on holiness, originate in the spirit of the age, the inclination of the natural man: to that spirit its oppressive yoke is most of all opposed. From the opposite quarter, the party that was truly theocratically minded, we cannot expect a work of deception: it should first be shown that that party had recourse to such means, in order to confirm its power and importance; and if the declaration be true, "*by their fruits ye shall know them*," this fruit would at once exhibit the corruptness of its author. But such a deception as would then have been practised with the Pentateuch, is also quite inconceivable for this reason, that the forgery was in this case most easy of discovery, as it related to nothing else than the foundation of the entire national and political system. The number of the persons deceived and led astray in this case would have been infinitely great. This was much less true of the poems of Homer,

as to their importance to Greece, yet even Herodotus (ii. 117, iv. 32) propounds doubts respecting their genuineness. And this was the case not merely with learned enquirers, and among educated nations; even Bœotians, according to Pausanias, were in their fashion such critics, as he says of them: *Βοιωτῶν δὲ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἑλικῶνα οἰκοῦντες παρειλημμένα δόξῃ λέγουσιν, ὡς ἄλλο Ἡσίοδος ποιῆσαι οὐδὲν ἢ τὰ ἔργα· καὶ τούτων δὲ τὸ ἐς τὰς Μούσας ἀφαιροῦσι προοίμιον, ἀρχὴν τῆς ποιήσεως εἶναι τὸ ἐς τὰς Ἔριδας λέγοντες* (ix. 31, 4.). The literary history of Homer, of the Orphic poems, of Musæus, &c., might supply a still larger number of such instances, if so plain a matter required any farther proof. Suffice it that even antiquity gives sufficient evidence of having been sensitive to such impositions; and the religious feeling, however often it may have been led astray by priestly dominion and superstition, yet has never allowed itself to be treated with such wanton mockery, that one could dare to use with it what was most sacred for a cloak of deception. If any where, it was pre-eminently so in Israel. The propensity to forgery first took root there, when the ancient sacred literature had become merely a subject for imitation, and when a degenerate age, that had become intimate with foreign habits, was incompetent to reproduce what was ancient except in a dull and spiritless manner; and therefore not in the period when its literature was vigorous and flourishing. Both people and priests, prophets and wise men, must have lost all feeling and taste with respect to their literary property, if they could have been prevailed upon to place at the head of their literature a work, which, as the production of forgery, would have been the most unworthy constituent portion of it.

3. The more that a nation becomes divided into important religious and political factions, the more difficult an undertaking does it become, to deceive it in such a way as must have been the case, in foisting the Pentateuch upon it. Such opposite parties can most convincingly be shown to have existed among the Israelites, in smaller as well as larger circles. We do not even require to make mention of the different courses pursued by the prophets, the kings, and the priests; each of whom, following separate aims, not unfrequently came into violent and hostile collision with the others. There are other opposite parties that we may here refer to, which at the same time supply still more striking proofs in reference to

our object. If the Pentateuch were a work that had its origin in or after the Captivity, it would be quite incomprehensible how it should then have found its way into Egypt and Samaria, and been able to assert such consideration for itself there, as was the case. Nobody strives to obtain possession of a novel thing, as the Samaritans strove for it; though one may for an ancient and venerable sacred object. And just as in that case the ground of the contention cannot have been an empty advantage, standing besides on the weak support of a fiction; neither can such have been the bond that was capable of holding together in some degree two parties of such divergent tendencies, as those of the Egyptian Judaism and the Judaism of Palestine. The same thing holds good also of the age prior to the Captivity, as of that of Josiah for instance, as well as of the period after Solomon in general; for we then find Judah and Israel standing in such direct opposition, that the fact of the most important religious document existing as the common property of both, can be explained only by the fact of its earlier existence. This tells also, however, against the origin of the Pentateuch in the times of David and Solomon, according to the remark of Eichhorn: "In particular, it is incomprehensible why Jeroboam, who shortly after that introduced the worship of the Calves in his newly-founded kingdom, did not expose the fictitious composition of the books which were opposed to his own religious institution; since the deception must have been easy of discovery, from the shortness of the time that had elapsed" (p. 211.). Still less can it be regarded as at all comprehensible that it should have taken place in the period of the Judges, when the distracted state of things divided tribes and families still more from one another.

4. There is also this additional consideration, that we are in possession of literary documents belonging to all those periods, the comparison of which with the Pentateuch shows but too plainly, that its peculiar character is so little in accordance with that of the post-Mosaic literature, that we cannot possibly regard such a kind of literary labour as belonging to the later period. "We see (says Leo, Univers. Gesch. i. p. 570, with reference to the period of the Judges) from the comparative poverty of the records in the book of Judges, that this was impossible." That the times of David and Solomon were affected by a totally different tendency requires no proof: that, on closer examination, we cannot attribute to them

even the poetical portions of the Pentateuch, is shown by the formal structure of the latter. The prophetic literature is as far from presenting a suitable analogy: indeed the prophetic element of the Pentateuch is by no means the only or preponderating element in it. But in the memorials of the Captivity and the subsequent period a far greater difference is discernible. Even from this general review it appears, that the whole compass of subsequent literary productions rests on the Pentateuch, which includes them in itself in their germ and commencement. Therefore, if the Pentateuch as a whole is to be comprehended and expounded, it can be done only by regarding it as a genuine work of the Mosaic age.

Exegetical aids.—In Patristic literature, the following are of special service for the study of the Pentateuch: Hieronymus (Quaest. in Gen. t. 3, l, ed. Vallars), Chrysostomus (Homill. in Gen.), Cyrillus Alex. (Com. in Pent. t. i. p. 2, ed. Paris.), Augustinus (De Genesi ad literam.).—Of the special commentaries of the Rabbins, Abarbanel's exposition (ed. Van Bashuysen, Hanov. 1710) deserves to be mentioned. See others in Carpzov, Intr. i. p. 51. sq.—Of the older Protestant expositors, Calvin, Mercerus, Drusius, Osiander; and of the Catholics, Bonfrerius; are still very deserving of attention. The historical matter has been best illustrated by Clericus, from whom principally Rosenmüller's Scholia borrow what they contain in that department. In more recent times, it is properly only Vater's work, which embraces the whole Pentateuch, that is of importance. The commentary, however, is so defective, and also full of particular arbitrary notions, that it can now hardly satisfy the most moderate requirements. Schumann has commenced a commentary on the Pentateuch, with one on Genesis; and Tiele has begun one on Genesis. The former contains single philological remarks that are of value, but as a whole extremely little of original matter. The latter may be recommended for practical use. There is also, besides these, Von Bohlen's Exposition of Genesis, which, considered as a Commentary, is a performance of no value. The Literature of the Pentateuch, particularly of Genesis, is very rich in works containing observations on particular passages. The chief of these are: J. Marck, Comm. in præcipuas

quasdam Pent. partes, Lugd. Bat. 1721. Sterringa, Observ Phil. Sac. in Pent. Ludg. 1721. Hackmanni Præcidanea. Sa t. i. Ludg. Bat. 1735. Haitsma, Curæ philol. in Gen. Franc 1753. Hensler, Bemerkk. üb. St. d. Pss. und der Genesis, 179 Gaab, Beitr. z. Erkl. der 1. 2. 4. Bücher Mosis, Tüb. 1796, &c.

PRINTED BY
M'COSH, PARK, AND DEWARS,
DUNDEE.

00111850

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016